

CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES

The land use planning process provides an opportunity for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Las Cruces District Office to reevaluate the way it manages the resources, resource uses, and other programs on public land within the *Planning Area* of Sierra, Otero, and Doña Ana Counties. As part of the *White Sands Resource Management Plan (RMP) Revision* and *White Sands RMP Amendment*, collectively referred to as the *TriCounty RMP*, the BLM Las Cruces District Office developed alternative land management strategies to address the issues that were identified early in the planning process (refer to Chapter 1) and to achieve resource goals and objectives. The potential environmental consequences of these management actions were evaluated, as well as the No-Action Alternative which is the continuation of existing management. The full analysis of the impacts of these alternatives on the resources can be found in Chapter 4.

There are four alternatives and they consist of land use plan-level decisions as defined in the BLM *Land Use Planning Handbook* (USDOI BLM 2005a). The land use plan management decisions fall into two categories: desired outcomes and allowable uses. Desired outcomes are goals and objectives for management of each resource and resource use. Allowable uses, including restricted or prohibited, achieve desired outcomes. This Chapter describes:

- A general description of the alternatives;
- Alternatives considered but not analyzed in detail;
- Detailed descriptions of alternatives including Continuing Management Guidance and Management Common to All Alternatives; and
- A summary comparing the potential impacts associated with each alternative.

2.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Three action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative are evaluated in the impact assessment for this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In general, the three action alternatives range in emphasis from resource conservation to resource use. Under all action alternatives, new oil and gas leasing would be deferred pending development of a programmatic RMP Amendment and EIS to address specific decisions for those resources prepared after the *TriCounty RMP/EIS* Record of Decision (ROD) is signed.

The **No-Action Alternative (or Alternative A)** is the continuation of existing management. Continuing management is defined for Sierra and Otero Counties by the 1986 *White Sands RMP*, as amended; and defined for Doña Ana County by the 1993 *White Sands RMP*, as amended. Under Alternative A, current management strategies would remain in place. Decisions that have been implemented based on the 1986 and 1993 RMPs would continue, and those that have not yet been implemented would be carried out.

Three action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) represent variations from existing management and were developed to address current issues and concerns in the *Planning Area*.

Alternative B places emphasis on conserving resources and reducing human use of public land. With this alternative, the BLM has defined a resource conservation approach while still providing for multiple uses. This alternative would assure protection of resources for long-term use and benefit. This would be achieved primarily through greater emphasis to conserve resource values associated with special designations, fish and wildlife habitat, and special status species habitat. In some areas, resource uses would be excluded to conserve sensitive resources.

Alternative C (Preferred Alternative), is the BLM's preferred alternative at the time of this Draft RMP/EIS. It provides a mix of resource protection and resource uses, prescribing resource conservation in specific areas while allowing for continued and, in some cases increased, resource uses in other areas. Management under this alternative would balance the need to protect, restore, and enhance natural values with the need to provide for the production of food, fiber, and minerals and to provide recreation, heritage tourism, and other services on public land. This balance would be achieved within the limits of the ecosystem's ability to provide resources on a sustainable basis and within the constraints of applicable laws and regulations. Measures to protect sensitive resources would be implemented, but they would be less restrictive than under Alternative B.

Alternative D generally places an emphasis on resource uses and production, while still providing for resource protection necessary to meet legal requirements. Under Alternative D, constraints on commodity production would be the least restrictive, while still complying with multiple uses in accordance with applicable law, regulation, and BLM policy. Under this alternative, long-term preservation of some resources for future use and benefit may not occur.

2.2 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The alternatives presented in the *TriCounty RMP/EIS* are designed to provide general management guidance for all resource programs in the *Decision Area*. Future proposals for site-specific actions would in almost all cases require more detailed environmental review in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The type of analysis required would be determined at the time an application is received or proposal is developed. Site-specific analysis would include surveys required by law or policy such as cultural resources surveys, special status species surveys, hazardous material site assessments, and so forth. Specific projects for some areas or resource programs may be detailed in future activity plans, project plans, and site-specific proposals. These plans and projects may be derived from broader decisions in the RMP or from internal management decisions. They address more precisely how a particular area or resource is to be managed and ensure compliance with the approved RMP. Usually, this would occur where the project or activity plan has not been specifically addressed in the *TriCounty RMP/EIS*. These plans and projects may include actions such as developing a travel management plan, issuing a right-of-way, or constructing range improvements.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

Several alternatives were considered as possible methods of resolving resource management issues and conflicts. Some of the alternatives considered were received during public scoping. Alternatives or components of alternatives identified as existing requirements under current laws, regulations, or standard operating procedures and policies were not carried forward for detailed analysis. The following alternatives were considered but were eliminated from detailed analysis for the reasons described.

2.3.1 REMOVAL OF TWO WILDERNESS STUDY DESIGNATIONS

During the scoping for the *TriCounty RMP*, a comment was submitted that the Wilderness Study Area (WSA) designations for Organ Needles and Peña Blanca should be removed because WSA management restricted other resource uses and the designations were not in accordance with current BLM policy. These areas were found to have wilderness characteristics as a result of land exchanges. The BLM acquired additional land in the Organ Needles and Peña Blanca inventory units.

During the preparation of the *White Sands RMP*, BLM policy required that areas meeting wilderness criteria be analyzed for designation as WSAs through the RMP process. This policy was based on interpretation of Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) (the land use planning section). At that time, areas that were found to have wilderness size and characteristics were designated as WSAs through the RMP process, and were managed under the *Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review* (1995). This guidance has been updated and superseded by BLM Manual 6330 *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. During the preparation of the *White Sands RMP*, no negative comments were received from the public regarding the designation of the two WSAs. Conditions have not substantially changed that would create new resource conflicts where none existed at the time the WSAs were designated.

As mandated by Section 603 of FLMPA, the BLM identified all land under its jurisdiction that contained wilderness characteristics through a process that concluded on October 21, 1993. WSAs were reported to Congress along with a recommendation as to their suitability or non-suitability to be preserved as wilderness. Criteria for designating WSAs are found in the BLM's *Wilderness Inventory Handbook* (1978). Until Congress acts to designate a WSA as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, or remove it from further consideration for wilderness, the BLM is required to manage the WSAs so as to prevent impairment of the area's suitability for preservation as wilderness. All WSAs would continue to be managed under the BLM's *Management of Wilderness Study Areas Manual* 6330 (2012b). Any areas not designated by Congress as wilderness and released from further study, would be managed according to the applicable management prescriptions in the *TriCounty RMP* such as Visual Resource Management (VRM) class, ACEC prescriptions, and vehicle use designations

In summary, the decision to designate the Organ Needles and Peña Blanca WSAs was made in the previous RMP in accordance with FLPMA section 202. Therefore, the status of these WSA designations will continue to be carried forward until Congress decides whether to retain or release these lands.

2.3.2 ELIMINATION OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING

An alternative that proposes to make the entire *Planning Area* unavailable for grazing would not meet the purpose and need of this Draft RMP/EIS. The NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this planning effort which requires the complete elimination of grazing within the *Decision Area* for their resolution. In fact, during public scoping of the RMP, livestock grazing was not brought up as an issue. The BLM has discretion through its grazing regulations and through the *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* (BLM 2000) to determine and adjust stocking levels, and seasons-of-use. Grazing management activities and forage allocation are determined in an RMP, therefore, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed in the absence of identified conflicts.

In accordance with BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (BLM 2005) and BLM IM No. 2012-169, the BLM considered a range of alternatives with respect to areas that are available and unavailable for livestock grazing, and forage adjustments. These alternatives provide a clear basis for choice by the decision-maker. All alternatives would allow suitable measures which could include a reduction or elimination of livestock grazing in specific situations where livestock grazing causes or contributes to conflicts with the other resource values or uses. The BLM considered but did not analyze in detail an alternative that would make all 2.8 million acres of public land in the *Decision Area* unavailable for livestock grazing because such an alternative is not reasonable, viable, or necessary in light of resource conditions.

Under Alternative B, the decision-maker may close allotments to grazing based on basic evidence of unmanageable conflicts compared to Alternative C under which the decision-maker must conduct an evaluation to document whether land health standards are achieved or not achieved based on long-term monitoring and make a determination to identify causal factors where standards are not achieved. Alternatives A and D close only the most sensitive habitats to grazing (1,686 acres and 1,156 acres, respectively).

On public land, livestock grazing is authorized by term permits lasting for up to 10 years and permit renewal is a discretionary action dependent on compliance with terms and conditions of the expiring permit, as well as monitoring and rangeland health assessments. During the permit renewal process, the BLM may analyze a no grazing alternative at the site-specific level.

Current resource conditions on BLM-administered land, including range vegetation, watershed, and wildlife habitat, as reflected in land health assessments, do not warrant prohibition of livestock grazing throughout the *TriCounty* area. For the purpose of this analysis, the range of alternatives in livestock grazing management provide for consideration of reduced grazing and appropriate grazing utilization levels. Impacts from such a management approach are described in Chapter 4 of this document.

2.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

This section discusses the resources and resource uses that address the purpose and need for the RMP changes and the resolution of issues. Each resource section contains Goals, Objectives, Continuing Management Guidance and Management Decisions Common to all Alternatives. Continuing Management Guidance can include applicable laws, and regulations, but the emphasis is on state and District policy guidance and direction with which the Las Cruces District Office complies. The primary authorizing laws, executive orders and regulations which direct BLM management are shown in Appendix A. Management Decisions Common to all Alternatives are the discretionary actions or decisions carried forward from previous planning documents that would be implemented under each alternative. Then the management prescriptions and uses for each alternative are described. At the end of Chapter 2 is a Summary Comparison of Impacts (Table 2-12), which shows a summary of the impacts across each alternative.

The BLM has identified Alternative C as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS. However, in developing the Final RMP, the BLM may select all or part of any one alternative for a particular resource or resource use. The Final RMP could be quite different from the Preferred Alternative in the Draft.

2.4.1 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

This section deals with areas that have been nominated for special management that can be designated through the RMP. Special designations are Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Historic Trails not Congressionally designated, Backcountry Byways, WSAs, National Historic Trails and Natural Landmarks (NNL).

Goals:

- Designate and manage areas that have special values, meet the relevance and importance criteria, and/or require special management to prevent risk of loss or damage to those characteristics and values.
- Protect National Wild and Scenic Rivers System-eligible segments in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM guidance (Manual 6400) (USDOI BLM 2012).

Objectives:

- Manage ACECs where relevance and importance criteria are met and special management is required to protect the identified values.
- Manage WSAs to protect naturalness; opportunities for primitive, unconfined recreation; and opportunities for solitude.

2.4.1.1 Special Designations Continuing Management Guidance

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern: ACECs are areas of concern where special management attention is required to protect life and safety from natural hazards or to protect or prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish or wildlife resources; or other natural systems or processes. *BLM Manual* Section 1613 and 43 CFR Section 1610.7-2 provide the criteria for designating ACECs and require that areas having potential for designation as ACECs be identified during the planning process.

In 1991, the New Mexico BLM entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) under which The TNC would: (1) review and evaluate existing ACECs and recommend management with regard to rare or sensitive plants, animals and ecological communities within or near these areas, and (2) identify, evaluate and recommend management for additional ACECs having rare, threatened, or sensitive plants, animals or communities. The TNC found nine areas containing rare or sensitive plants or animals (BLM special status species) or their habitats. It was determined that all nine areas met the relevance and importance criteria to be nominated as an ACEC. Three of these areas were designated ACECs in Otero County (1997). The other six are considered here.

Other outside groups have submitted nominations for ACEC designations. A BLM interdisciplinary team evaluated the nominations and those areas that were found to contain values meeting the relevance and importance criteria were carried forward into the *TriCounty RMP*. The ACEC process is detailed in Appendix G. A report of evaluations and findings for all nominated ACECs is available from the Las Cruces District Office.

National Historic Trail: One designated national historic trail, the El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, passes through the *Planning Area*. The trail is managed according to the *El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan* prepared by the BLM and the National Park Service in 2004. The trail was the primary route from Mexico City to Northern New Mexico during the Spanish colonial period, 1598-1821. The management plan establishes the administrative objectives, policies, and management actions needed to fulfill the preservation and public use goals for the trail and is hereby incorporated by reference as part of the *TriCounty RMP*.

Backcountry Byway: The BLM's Backcountry Byways Program designates special roads, crossing public land, for their scenic attributes. Most of the public land found along the byways is remote and provides both solitude and recreational opportunities. The Lake Valley Backcountry Byway, designated by the BLM State Director in 1993, would continue to be managed as a designated backcountry byway.

National Natural Landmark: Kilbourne Hole is a designated NNL and is managed to maintain the naturalness and the integrity of its unique volcanic-related features.

Wild and Scenic Rivers: Eligible river segments were evaluated and suitable segments were identified for inclusion and protection in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM guidance (BLM Manual 6400).

2.4.1.2 Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives

Under all alternatives, the existing WSA and ACEC designations would continue and would be managed to protect the resource values of those areas (Table 2-1, Table 2-2). In the 1993 *White Sands RMP*, five ACECs were designated in Doña Ana County. In 1997, a RMP Amendment for the Whites Sands RMP designated six ACECs in Otero County. The Las Cruces District Office would also continue to manage the Kilbourne Hole NNL under all alternatives. Decisions regarding management of fluid minerals in existing ACECs from previous RMPs and amendments would be carried forward unchanged under all alternatives. Maps of each of the existing and proposed ACECs are shown in Appendix J.

Motor and mechanical vehicle use in all existing ACECs would be limited to designated routes to be determined through area-specific travel management activity planning upon completion of the *TriCounty RMP/EIS*. See Appendix O for the post-RMP travel management planning procedure.

TABLE 2-1 EXISTING ACEC ACREAGE IN TRICOUNTY PLANNING AREA BY ALTERNATIVE				
ACEC	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Aden Lava Flow ¹	3,746	Same as A	0	0
Alamo Mountain ²	2,528	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Alkali Lakes	6,348	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Cornudas Mountain ²	852	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Doña Ana Mountains	1,427	3,181	3,181	Same as A
Los Tules	24	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Organ/Franklin Mountains	58,417 ³	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Rincon	856	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Robledo Mountains	7,077 ⁴	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Sacramento Escarpment	4,474	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
San Diego	623	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Three Rivers Petroglyph	1,043	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
Wind Mountain ²	2,308	Same as A	Same as A	Same as A
TOTAL EXISTING	89,723	91,477	87,731	85,977
NOTES:				
¹ Aden Lava Flow is currently designated a Research Natural Area (RNA) and would be designated an ACEC in Alternative B, and not designated in Alternatives C and D. However, all of the RNA is within the Aden Lava Flow WSA so would continue to be managed as WSA under Alternatives C and D.				
² Under Alternatives B and C, Cornudas Mountain, Alamo Mountain and Wind Mountain would be incorporated into the larger proposed Otero Mesa Grasslands ACEC.				
³ Includes 19,770 acres of WSAs acreage within the Organ Mountains ACEC boundary.				
⁴ Does not include 789 acres in the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument.				

Non-Federally owned lands within or contiguous with an ACEC would be priorities for acquisition by the BLM. Acquired in-holdings or edge holdings within or adjacent to an ACEC would be managed according to the ACEC prescription until the acquired area could be evaluated to determine if it contained resources that met the relevance and importance criteria. If relevant and important values for which the ACEC was designated were found on the acquired lands, those lands would be added to that ACEC and managed accordingly. No new ACECs would be designated under Alternative A. All proposed ACECs would be designated under Alternative B, some proposed ACECs would be designated under Alternative C, and none would be designated under Alternative D (Tables 2-3, 2-4).

2.4.1.3 Special Designations Management Direction by Alternative

2.4.1.3.1 *ACECs*

At the beginning of preparing this RMP, Las Cruces District Office staff nominated a number of ACECs for protection and management of scenic, ecological, cultural, botanical, geological and other values. An interdisciplinary team determined that eight of these met the relevance and importance criteria to be nominated an ACEC and these eight are considered here. A decision common to all would be exclusion of industrial and commercial development that would negatively impact the ACEC resource values.

During public scoping for this RMP, the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance and the Wilderness Society nominated 16 areas for special designations including: ACECs, primitive recreation areas, research natural areas, outstanding natural areas, and scenic areas. Since the ACEC designation is the only legally recognized administrative designation available to BLM, all 16 nominations were evaluated as potential ACECs by the BLM interdisciplinary staff. Nine areas met the importance and relevance criteria for ACEC designation and are considered here.

TABLE 2-2 PROPOSED ACEC ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE				
PROPOSED ACEC	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Broad Canyon	0	4,721	0	0
Brokeoff Mountains	0	61,224 ¹	3,971	0
Caballo Mountain	0	17,268	0	0
Cornucopia	0	16,037	0	0
East Potrillo Mountains	0	11,460	0	0
Jarilla Mountains	0	6,219	0	0
Mud Mountain	0	2,579	2,579	0
Nutt Mountain	0	0	756	0
Otero Mesa Grasslands ²	0	271,262 ²	198,511 ²	0
Percha Creek	0	870	870	0
Picacho Peak	0	950	950	0
Pup Canyon	0	3,677	3,677	0
Sacramento Mountains	0	2,381	2,381	0
Six Shooter Canyon	0	1,060	1,060	0
Southern Caballo Mountains	0	24,117	0	0
Tularosa Creek	0	236	236	0
Tortugas Mountain	0	1,936	0	0
VanWinkle Lake	0	0	1,320	0
TOTAL PROPOSED NEW ACECS	0	16	11	0
ACREAGE OF PROPOSED ACECS	0	425,997	216,311	0
NOTES:				
¹ Includes 3,110 acres of Brokeoff Mountains WSA.				
² Under Alternatives B and C, Alamo Mountain , Cornudas Mountain, Wind Mountain and the proposed VanWinkle Lake would be incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grasslands ACEC. Acres shown do not include the three existing ACECs in order to avoid duplicating acres shown in Table 2-2 . Total acreage for Alternative B including the three existing ACECs would be 276,950; for Alternative C it would be 204,199. Otero Mesa Grasslands Alternative B would also include the proposed Van Winkle Lake ACEC (1,320 acres).				

In 2006, BLM staff proposed to expand the existing Robledo Mountains ACEC to include the existing Paleozoic Trackways RNA. With the passage of the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009 which designated the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument, the expansion of the Robledo Mountains ACEC was dropped.

The proposed ACECs would be designated under Alternatives B and C (Table 2-2) and no new ACECs would be designated under Alternatives A and D. The proposed Otero Mesa Grasslands ACEC would incorporate three existing ACECs – Alamo Mountain, Cornudas Mountain, and Wind Mountain in Alternative B.

Existing ACECs would be managed as shown in Table 2-3 and proposed ACECs would be managed as shown in Table 2-4. Individual maps of each ACEC are located in Appendix J and by alternative on Maps 2-2 through 2-5.

2.4.1.3.2 *Historic Trails*

One congressionally designated National Historic Trail and two non-designated historic trails traverse the *Planning Area*. In addition, one RNA and a NNL also are designated within the *Planning Area*. The Paleozoic Trackways RNA was designated in the *White Sands RMP*. However, that area is included in the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument designated in the 2009 National Public Lands Omnibus Bill and is addressed in a separate RMP. Table 2-5 describes how these areas would be managed under each alternative and Maps 2-2 through 2-5 show their locations.

2.4.1.3.1 *Wilderness Study Areas*

As mandated by Section 603 of FLPMA, the BLM identified all land under its jurisdiction that contained wilderness characteristics through a process that concluded on October 21, 1993. WSAs were reported to Congress along with a recommendation as to their suitability or non-suitability to be preserved as wilderness. Criteria for designating WSAs are found in the BLM's *Wilderness Inventory Handbook* (1978). Until Congress acts to designate a WSA as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, or remove it from further consideration for wilderness, the BLM is required to manage the WSAs so as to prevent impairment of the area's suitability for preservation as wilderness. All WSAs would continue to be managed under the BLM's *Management of Wilderness Study Areas Manual* (2012b). All WSAs would be designated and managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I areas, per BLM Policy. Any areas not designated by Congress as wilderness and released from further study, would be managed according to the applicable management prescriptions of the adjacent lands in the *TriCounty RMP* such as VRM class, ACEC prescriptions, and vehicle use designations.

Ten existing WSAs would continue to be designated WSAs and managed according to the *Management of Wilderness Study Areas Manual* (Table 2-6) (Maps 2-2 through 2-5). See Appendix J for individual WSA maps. Approximately 4,000 acres of the Jornada del Muerto WSA is within Sierra County but the majority of the WSA is in Socorro County. The entire WSA is managed according to the *Management of Wilderness Study Areas Manual* (2012b) and the Socorro RMP (US DOI BLM 2010), and the acreage is shown as part of the TriCounty *Decision Area* to show the true picture of WSA management.

TABLE 2-6 EXISTING WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS	
WILDERNESS STUDY AREA	ACREAGE
1. Aden Lava Flow	25,287
2. Brokeoff Mountains	31,606
3. Jornada del Muerto ¹	4,319
4. Las Uvas Mountains	11,067
5. Organ Mountains	7,283
6. Organ Needles	7,630
7. Peña Blanca	4,470
8. Robledo Mountains	12,946
9. West Potrillo Mountains ² / 10. Mount Riley	157,185
TOTAL ACRES	261,793
NOTES: ¹ Includes only the acreage in Sierra County. ² Does not include approximately 10,300 acres in Luna County.	

2.4.1.3.2 *Wild And Scenic Rivers*

The BLM will consider decisions affecting eligible rivers that would protect and/or enhance free-flowing conditions, water quality, and identified outstandingly remarkable values. An inventory of streams in the *Decision Area* is described in Appendix P.

Alternative A: Preserve the tentative classification of each eligible segment by protecting its free-flowing nature, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable value(s) and determine suitability at a later date (see Appendix P).

Alternative B: Determine all eligible stream segments as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Alternative C: Determine all river segments as not suitable, and not recommended for Congressional designation within the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Alternative D: Determine the Tularosa Creek stream segments as suitable and recommended for Congressional designation in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Aden Lava Flow (Map J-7) <i>Biological, Scenic, Geological, and Research Resources</i>	3,746 Acres Maintain Research Natural Area designation and manage as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to mineral material disposal and free use. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing. • Consider chemical brush control where necessary to meet desired plant community objectives. • Research and interpret paleontological and geological features. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Limit vehicle use to designated roads and trails. • Establish research permitting/information exchange process. • Designate parking area (0.25 acre) and trail to Crater. • Manage for Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) primitive and semiprimitive nonmotorized classes. • Develop grazing activity plan. 	3,746 Acres Same as Alternative A except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate area as an ACEC and use management prescriptions from Alternative A. • Close to vehicle use. • 	Remove Research Natural Area designation and do not designate as an ACEC. The area currently designated as the RNA lies wholly within the Aden Lava Flow WSA so would be managed as described in BLM Manual 6330.	Same as Alternative C.
Alamo Mountain (Map J-18) <i>Scenic, Cultural and Ecological Resources</i>	2,528 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public land. • Exclude new rights-of-way; allow other realty actions with stipulations. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Withdraw from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to vegetation sales. • Exclude new wildlife waters. 	The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative B and managed accordingly. See Table 2-4.	The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative C and managed accordingly See Table 2-4.	2,528 Acres Same as Alternative A except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid all new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage area for Barbary sheep. • Designate the Cornudas Mountain snail as a BLM sensitive species. • Nominate area to National Register of Historic Places. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Close to vehicle use. • Allow recreation access. Limit camping; develop parking area. • Do not implement an interpretation program other than signing. • Develop activity management to include the Butterfield Trail. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage barbary sheep habitat to maintain or increase population goals in coordination with NMDGF to meet hunting demand, consistent with land health standards. • Nominate area to National Register of Historic Places. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes.
Alkali Lakes (Map J-20) <i>Special Status Plant Species</i>	6,348 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public land; acquire State trust land, including minerals, from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to sale of mineral material. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Withdraw from mineral entry. • Close to vegetation sales. • Manage as VRM Class IV. • Designate area as limited for vehicle use; close no roads. • Allow recreation access, but do not allow camping or fires. • Develop activity management plan. 	6,348 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage as VRM Class III. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes upon completion of travel management planning. 	6,348 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. 	6,348 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.
Cornudas Mountains (Map J-17) <i>Scenic and Cultural Resources</i>	852 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public land. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Withdraw from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposal. 	<p>The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative B and managed accordingly.</p> <p>See Table 2-4.</p>	<p>The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative C and managed accordingly.</p> <p>See Table 2-4.</p>	852 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to vegetation sales. • Develop no new wildlife waters. • Manage for Barbary sheep. • Nominate area to National Register of Historic Places. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Limit vehicles to designated routes. • Mitigate cultural resources. • Allow recreation access to the southeastern corner by permit. No camping. • Implement minimal interpretation program. • Implement signing. • Develop an activity management plan to include Butterfield Trail. • Allow no new fencing. • Designate the Cornudas Mountain land snail as a Sensitive Species. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage Barbary sheep habitat to maintain or increase population goals in coordination with NMDGF to meet hunting demand, consistent with land health standards. • Manage 850 acres as VRM Class II. • Implement directional and informational signing only.
Doña Ana Mountains (Map J-12) <i>Biological, Scenic, and Cultural Resources</i>	1,427 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to mineral material sale. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing. • Maintain current livestock grazing practices. • Exclude feral goats and other exotic animals. • Manage for primitive and semiprimitive recreational opportunities. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close roads that provide access for illegal plant collecting. 	3,181 Acres Same as Alternative A except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enlarge existing ACEC to 3,181 acres. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Maintain closure to all fluid minerals on 1,400-acre existing ACEC. Close remaining area to geothermal energy leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Maintain current livestock grazing practices. 	3,181 Acres Same as Alternative B except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	1,427 Acres Same as Alternative A except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage recreation the same as for the Doña Ana Mountains SRMA. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Do not develop primitive campsites in the bowl on the north side. • Do not manage according to ROS system.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop primitive campsites in the “bowl” on north side (10 acres). • Manage for ROS semi-primitive non--motorized, semi-primitive motorized, and roaded natural classes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage recreation the same as Doña Ana Mountains SRMA. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude commercial development that would negatively impact the ACEC resource values.. 		
Los Tules (MapJ-10) <i>Cultural Resources</i>	24 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land and acquire adjacent private land from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Designate no surface occupancy for fluid mineral leasing. • Close to mineral sales. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Close to vehicle use. • Fence or cover pit house site with sterile fill (0.75-mile-long fence; 0.25 acre). • Manage for ROS semi-primitive non-motorized class. 	23 Acres <p>Consider conveyance to New Mexico Parks Division under R&PP Act. Until then manage the same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as VRM Class III. • Close to vehicle use. • Do not manage according to the ROS system. • Exclude commercial development that would negatively impact the ACEC resource values. 	23 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	23 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Organ/Franklin Mountains (Maps J-8 & J-9) <i>Biological, Scenic, Cultural, Special Status Species (Plant and Animal), and Riparian, Resources.</i>	58,417 Acres (19,770 acres within WSA; 38,647 acres outside WSAs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land; acquire State trust and private inholdings from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way except within existing utility corridors. • Acquire legal public access. • Maintain the existing Classification and Multiple Use Act classification for minerals until protective withdrawal is established. 	58,417 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close vehicle routes in WSAs. • Exclude new ROWs, except within existing ROWs. 	58,417 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	58,417 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Withdraw from mineral entry. • Manage as Class II air quality. • Manage mountainous portions (above 5,000 feet) as VRM Class I; manage other portions as VRM Class III or IV. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes except for the scenic ACEC portion (8,800 acres), which is closed to vehicle use. • Manage in accordance with the <i>Organ Mountains Coordinated Resource Management Plan</i>. • Prohibit dogs and pets and require hiking on designated trails only in upper Ice Canyon above drift fence. • Manage for ROS primitive, semi-primitive, non-motorized, semi-primitive, and roaded natural classes. • Monitor the area in accordance with limits of acceptable change with emphasis on the most biologically or culturally sensitive areas. 			

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Rincon (Map J-13) <i>Cultural Resources</i>	856 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land; acquire State trust land in southern half of Section 32 from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Manage as no surface occupancy for fluid-mineral leasing within 100 feet of petroglyph site. • Close to mineral material disposal outside existing rock quarry. • Evaluate potential to interpret the petroglyphs. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Manage for semi-primitive non-motorized recreation. 	856 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude commercial development that would negatively impact the ACEC resource values • Do not manage according to the ROS system. 	856 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	856 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes.
Robledo Mountains (Map J-11) <i>Biological and Scenic Resources.</i>	7,077 Acres <p>Manage areas outside the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument (PTNM) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land; acquire State Trust and private inholdings from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing. • Acquire legal public access. • Manage for primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes • Allow natural fires to burn under prescribed conditions. 	7,077 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquire State trust and private inholdings from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. Do not accept new communication site use applications for Lookout Mountain. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing. • Acquire legal public access. • Manage 4,000 acres as VRM Class I and manage 3,077 acres as VRM Class II. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	7,077 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	7,077 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Sacramento Escarpment (Map J-16) <i>Scenic Resources</i>	4,474 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public land; acquire mineral estate on two parcels from willing sellers. • Exclude rights-of-way; allow other realty actions in “new” area with stipulations. • Acquire access as needed. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to vegetation sales. • Withdraw from mineral entry under general mining law. (This was done through PLO7375/NMNM86816, January 12, 1999). • Manage as VRM Class I and II. • Limit vehicles to existing routes, but close approximately 5 miles of road. • Establish parking area and maintain trails. • Develop and implement directional signing. • Develop activity management plan. • Do not install new fencing. 	4,474 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	4,474 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	4,474 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude commercial development that would negatively impact the ACEC resource values.
San Diego Mountain (Map J-14) <i>Cultural Resources</i>	623 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land; acquire adjacent private inholdings from willing sellers. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Manage for research rather than interpretive value. • Encourage rock art research. • Manage for ROS semi-primitive non-motorized class. 	623 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	623 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	623 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid all new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes.

TABLE 2-3

EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Three Rivers Petroglyph Site (Map J-15) <i>Cultural Resources</i>	1,043 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public land; acquire State trust land from willing sellers. • Allow new rights-of-way on additional lands with stipulations. • Withdraw from entry. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Nominate to National Register of Historic Places (National Register). • Acquire mineral estate on reconveyed lands from willing sellers. • Close to vegetation sales. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Designate as limited vehicle use. • Close to shooting. • Develop activity plan. • Fence area boundary (completed). • Develop and implement interpretive signing. • Develop new trails. 	1,043 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Recommend withdrawal from entry. • Nominate to National Register. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Manage recreation in accordance with the Three Rivers Petroglyph SRMA. 	1,043 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	1,043 Acres <p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.
Wind Mountain (Map J-19) <i>Cultural and Scenic Resources</i>	2,308 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Withdraw from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to vegetation sales. • Construct new wildlife waters. • Manage for Barbary sheep. • Designate the Cornudas Mountain land snail as a Sensitive Species. • Manage as VRM Class I. 	<p>The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative B and managed accordingly</p> <p>See Table 2-4.</p>	<p>The existing ACEC would be wholly incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland Alternative C and managed accordingly.</p> <p>See Table 2-4.</p>	2,308 Acres <p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage Barbary sheep habitat to maintain or increase population goals in coordination with NMDGF to meet hunting demand, consistent with land health standards • Manage as VRM Class II.

TABLE 2-3**EXISTING ACECS: MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS & ACREAGE BY ALTERNATIVE**

ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designate area as limited for vehicle use.• Mitigate cultural resources.• Close no roads.• Allow recreation access.• Install directional signing.• Develop activity management plan.• Do not install new fencing.			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limit vehicles to designated routes.• Do not develop an activity management plan.

	TABLE 2-4 PROPOSED AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE*	
ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C
Broad Canyon (Map J-21) <i>Scenic and Biological Resources and Cultural Resources</i>	4,721 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Exclude new rights-of-way • Close to mineral material disposal. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage as VRM Class II. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
Brokeoff Mountains (Maps J-23, J-24, & J-25) <i>Ecological and Cultural Resources</i>	61,224 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Acquire State trust land inholdings from willing sellers. 	3,971 Acres Same as Alternative B except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.
Caballo Mountains (Map J-32) <i>Scenic Resources</i>	17,268 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to geothermal leasing • Close to mineral material disposal. • Exclude new rights-of-way outside of existing communication site. Limit communication facilities authorizations to existing facilities and sites. • Manage existing communication site facilities according to the communication site plan. • Manage as VRM Class 1 except for the existing communication site. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
Cornucopia (formerly Southern Sacramento Mountains) (Map J-26) <i>Cultural resources</i>	16,037 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude new rights-of-way • Close to geothermal leasing • Close to mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class II. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
East Potrillo Mountains (Map J-39) <i>Scenic Resources</i>	11,460 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to existing routes. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Acquire State trust land inholdings from willing sellers. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.

TABLE 2-4 PROPOSED AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE*		
ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C
Jarilla Mountains (Map J-31) <i>Special Status Plant Species And Ecological Resources</i>	6,219 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain vehicle closure on 700 acres and limit vehicle use to designated routes the rest of the ACEC. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class III • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Acquire land that would improve the manageability of the area from willing sellers. Consider need for reclamation of abandoned mine land in any acquisition. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
Mud Mountain (Map J-33) <i>Special Status Plant Species and Ecological Resources</i>	2,579 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Defer oil and gas leasing until completion of an RMP Amendment addressing leasing/development. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Exclude new rights-of-way. 	2,579 Acres Same as Alternative B.
Nutt Mountain (Map J-34) <i>Ecological and Scenic Resources</i>	Do not designate area as an ACEC	756 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Nutt Mountain ACEC • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Exclude new ROWs. • Manage as VRM Class I.
Otero Mesa Grassland (Map J-40) <i>Ecological Resources and Wildlife Habitat</i>	271,262 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the existing Alamo Mountain, Cornudas Mountain, and Wind Mountain ACECs into this ACEC and continue their fluid mineral leasing closure. • Incorporate proposed Van Winkle ACEC (1,320 acres). • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Designate 44,200 acres surrounding the existing ACECs as VRM I (Map 2-7). • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to vegetation sales. • Manage barbary sheep habitat consistent with NMDGF population goals. • Close to geothermal leasing • Nominate suitable sites to National Register of Historic Places. • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Implement directional and informational signing. 	198,511 Acres Same as Alternative B except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude the ACEC from solar, wind, and geothermal energy projects. • Manage existing ACECs as VRM I and the remainder of ACEC as VRM IV. • Avoid new rights-of-ways. • Do not recommend withdrawal from mineral entry except for Alamo Mountain, Cornudas Mountain, and Wind Mountain. • Close to mineral material disposal only in VRM I.

TABLE 2-4 PROPOSED AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE*		
ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C
Percha Creek (Map J-38) <i>Riparian, Special Status Species, and Ecological Resources</i>	870 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to vehicle use. • Exclude new rights-of-way • Keep livestock enclosure. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material sale. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Close to grazing. • Fence boundary. • Implement aquatic habitat improvement projects. • Remove exotic flora/ fauna, reestablish native species. • Stock trout species to develop a sport fishery. • Consider acquiring adjacent non-Federal land. 	870 Acres Same as Alternative B.
Picacho Peak (Map J-36) <i>Scenic and Cultural Resources</i>	950 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Manage as VRM Class I. 	950 Acres Same as Alternative B.
Pup Canyon (Map J-27) <i>Special Status Plant Species and Ecological Resources</i>	3,677 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate into Brokeoff Mountains ACEC and manage accordingly. 	3,677 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not incorporate as part of Brokeoff Mountains ACEC • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Manage as VRM Class II.
Sacramento Mountains (North and South) (Map J-28) <i>Special Status Plant Species and Ecological Resources</i>	2,381 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close area to vehicle use. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class II. 	2,381 Acres Same as Alternative B except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Avoid new rights-of-way.
Six Shooter Canyon (Map J-29) <i>Special Status Plant Species and Ecological Resources</i>	1,060 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close area to vehicle use. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Exclude new rights-of-way 	1, 060 Acres Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 2-4 PROPOSED AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE*		
ACEC & VALUES	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C
Southern Caballo Mountains Map J-37) <i>Cultural Resources</i>	24,117 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Manage El Camino Real section according to the <i>El Camino Comprehensive Management Plan</i>. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Acquire State inholdings and edges from willing sellers. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
Tortugas Mountain (Map J-22) <i>Soils and Geomorphology Resources</i>	1,936 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Manage as VRM Class III. • Manage according to the SRMA plan as appropriate. • Continue to allow traditional uses, religious and other.. 	Do not designate area as an ACEC.
Tularosa Creek (Map J-30) <i>Riparian and Aquatic Resources</i>	236 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Close to grazing. Fence boundary. • Implement aquatic habitat improvement projects. • Remove exotic flora/ fauna, reestablish native species. • Stock trout species to develop a sport fishery. • Consider acquiring adjacent non-Federal land. 	Same as Alternative B.
VanWinkle Lake (Map J-45) <i>Ecological Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included in Otero Mesa Grassland ACEC Alternative B. 	1,320 Acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to Designated Routes. • Avoid new rights-of-way. • Exclude solar energy projects. • Close to geothermal leasing. • Close to mineral materials disposal. • Close to vegetative sales. • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.
NOTE: *No ACECs are newly proposed for Alternatives A and D.		

TABLE 2-5 MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS FOR OTHER SPECIAL AREAS		
AREA	ALTERNATIVES A & D	ALTERNATIVES B & C
El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail (NHT)	<p>The trail would be managed according to El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail Management Plan (2004a).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would not be allowed within ¼-mile of each side of well-defined sections of the trail. • Visual resources would be managed as VRM Class II within 5 miles each side of the trail. • Conservation easements and non-Federal land containing sections of the trail would be acquired. 	<p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would not be allowed within ½-mile each side of the trail. • An implementation plan for El Camino Real NHT Comprehensive Management Plan would be prepared.
Butterfield Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would not be allowed within ¼-mile each side of the trail. • A No Surface Occupancy stipulation would be applied for fluid mineral leasing or application for permit to drill within ¼-mile of the trail. • An area ¼-mile each side of the trail would be closed to mineral material disposal. • Facilities including power lines would not be constructed parallel to the trail. Facilities that cross the trail would be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would not be allowed within ½-mile each side of the trail. • A No Surface Occupancy stipulation would be applied for geothermal leasing or drilling within ½-mile of the trail. • An area ½-mile each side of the trail would be closed to mineral material disposal. • Facilities including power lines would not be constructed parallel to the trail. Facilities that cross the trail would be considered.
Mormon Battalion Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No surface disturbance within ¼-mile of the trail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would not be allowed within ½-mile each side of the trail.
Lake Valley Backcountry Byway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No surface disturbance within ½-mile each side. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No surface disturbance would be allowed within ½-mile each side of the Byway except for routine maintenance within the highway right-of-way.
Aden Lava Flow (Map J-1)	<p>Continue to manage 3,700 acres as a Research Natural Area (RNA) within the Aden Lava Flow WSA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated roads and trails. • Exclude authorizations for new rights-of way. • Close to mineral materials sales. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Consider chemical brush control in some portions where necessary to meet desired plant community objectives. • Research and interpret paleontological and geological features. • Establish research permitting/information exchange process. • Designate a parking area (¼-acre) and trail to Aden Crater. • Manage as VRM Class II. • Manage for ROS primitive and semi-primitive nonmotorized classes. • Develop a grazing activity plan. 	<p>ACEC designation would be removed and the area would continue to be managed as part of the Aden Lava Flow WSA.</p>

TABLE 2-5 MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS FOR OTHER SPECIAL AREAS		
AREA	ALTERNATIVES A & D	ALTERNATIVES B & C
Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark (Map J-41)	<p>Continue to manage 5,500 acres as a National Natural Landmark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all public land; acquire all State trust and private inholdings through exchange or purchase at fair market value, provided that the landowner is in agreement with such acquisitions. • Limit vehicle use to designated roads and trails. • Exclude authorizations for new rights-of-way. • Close to mineral material sales. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Consider chemical brush control in some portions where necessary to meet desired plant community objectives. • Establish safety no shooting restrictions within the rim. • Interpret geological features by signing. • Establish primitive facilities (parking area, table, and toilets) (2 acres). • Manage as VRM Class II. • Manage for ROS semi-primitive motorized class. 	<p>Same as Alternative A except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.

2.4.2 LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Section 201 of FLPMA requires the BLM to maintain on a continuing basis an inventory of all public land and its resources and other values, which includes wilderness characteristics. The BLM will update its inventory under these circumstances:

- The public or the BLM identifies wilderness characteristic as an issue during the NEPA process;
- The BLM is undertaking a land use planning process;
- The BLM has new information concerning resource conditions;
- A project that may impact wilderness characteristics is undergoing NEPA analysis;
- The BLM acquires additional lands;
- Road decommissioning or abandonment;
- Reclamation to a natural state;
- Removal of substantially noticeable human made features;
- Other changes relevant to wilderness characteristics.

In accordance with policy outlined in Instruction Memorandum 2011-154 (*Requirement to Conduct and Maintain Inventory Information for Wilderness Characteristics and to Consider Lands with Wilderness Characteristics in Land Use Plans*), this RMP addresses the wilderness characteristics of lands in the *Decision Area*. Where lands are found to contain wilderness character, the BLM considers a full range of alternatives for such lands. This RMP will analyze the effects of (1) plan alternatives on lands with wilderness characteristics and (2) management of lands with wilderness characteristics on other resources and resource uses.

The Las Cruces District Office determined that four areas, Nutt Grasslands, Bar Canyon, Peña Blanca South and Peña Blanca North, totaling approximately 11,494 acres in the *Decision Area* contain wilderness characteristics.

2.4.2.1 Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives

An inventory of lands with wilderness characteristics would be updated and maintained by the BLM under all alternatives. Where areas are identified as lands with wilderness characteristics, a decision would be made as to whether the area should be managed to maintain lands with wilderness characteristics or to manage the areas for other uses which could impair lands with wilderness characteristics.

2.4.2.2 Management Direction by Alternative

Alternative A (No Action): There is no similar decision under the existing management.

Alternative B: Approximately 10,691 acres in the Nutt Grasslands (including Nutt Mountain) area would be specifically managed to protect wilderness characteristics (see Table 2-7 and Map J-42).

A total of 423 acres of land in the area known as Bar Canyon on the west side of the Organ Mountains, 260 acres of land in the Peña Blanca South area, and 120 acres of land in the Peña Blanca North would be specifically managed to protect wilderness characteristics. They are contiguous to the existing Peña Blanca WSA (see Table 2-7).

TABLE 2-7 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS	
ALTERNATIVE	BAR CANYON, PEÑA BLANCA SOUTH and PEÑA BLANCA NORTH
A	There are no identified lands with wilderness characteristics under the existing management.
B	<p>Manage 803 acres of acquired land as follows to protect wilderness characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory for wilderness characteristics • Inventory for relevant and important values for potential ACEC nomination • Exclude ROW authorizations. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Inventory vehicle routes and close routes that may cause adverse impacts to resource values. • Limit vehicle use to designated roads and trails. • Close to mineral material sales. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Manage as Class II for air quality. • Manage for ROS primitive and semi-primitive.
C	Same as B.
D	<p>Manage 423 acres known as Bar Canyon to protect wilderness characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory for wilderness characteristics • Inventory for relevant and important values for potential ACEC nomination • Exclude ROW authorizations. • Manage as VRM Class I. • Inventory vehicle routes and close routes that may cause adverse impacts to resource values. • Limit vehicle use to designated roads and trails. • Close to mineral material sales. • Close to fluid mineral leasing. • Manage as Class II for air quality. • Manage for ROS primitive and semi-primitive.
ALTERNATIVE	NUTT GRASSLANDS (Map J-34)
A	There are no identified lands with wilderness characteristics under the existing management.
B	<p>Manage 10,691 acres to protect wilderness characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain land in Federal ownership. • Defer oil and gas leasing pending completion of a programmatic RMP Amendment addressing oil and gas leasing and development. • Close to mineral material disposal. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Exclude commercial development including renewable energy projects that would negatively impact wilderness characteristics. • Limit vehicle use, both motorized and mechanized, to designated routes. • Continue current livestock grazing use (as of the time of completion of this RMP). • Manage as VRM Class II <p>Prohibit any other actions that would negatively impact wilderness characteristics.</p>
C	Do not manage lands to protect wilderness characteristics.
D	Do not manage lands to protect wilderness characteristics

Alternative C: The Nutt Grasslands would not be managed to protect the wilderness characteristics in that area. Except for 756 acres proposed for Nutt Mountain ACEC designation, the rest of the area would be managed for other priority uses.

Bar Canyon, Peña Blanca South, and Peña Blanca North would be specifically managed to protect wilderness characteristics (see Table 2-7 and Map J-43).

Alternative D: The Nutt Grasslands would not be managed to protect the wilderness characteristics in that area.

Approximately 423 acres known as Bar Canyon would be specifically managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Bar Canyon is contiguous to Peña Blanca WSA (see Map J-44).

2.4.3 RESOURCES

2.4.3.1 AIR RESOURCES

Air resources include air quality and climate. Because it is unknown to what extent the management actions in the Las Cruces District would affect climate and vice-versa, no actions which could proactively address climate are identified in this section. When further information on the impacts to climate is known, such information would be incorporated into the BLM's planning and NEPA documents as appropriate.

Goal:

- Meet all applicable local, State, tribal, and National Ambient Air Quality Standards established under the Clean Air Act (as amended) and prevent significant deterioration of air quality from all direct and authorized actions, within the natural range of variability.

Objective:

- Manage surface-disturbing activities to maintain air quality consistent with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

2.4.3.1.1 *Air Resources Continuing Management Guidance*

BLM actions and use authorizations must comply with applicable local, state, tribal, and Federal air quality laws, statutes, regulations, standards, and implementation plans. The New Mexico Environment Department also regulates smoke management through requirements for the use of prescribed fires. In addition, the BLM would comply with Department and Agency guidance with regard to climate change and greenhouse gas inventories.

2.4.3.1.2 *Air Resources Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Air quality impacts caused by activities on public land would be reduced by mitigation measures developed on a case-by-case basis through statutory or regulatory processes. These processes generally would be applicable to BLM or other Federally-sponsored activities in the *Planning Area*. Best management practices related to fire and air quality are common to all alternatives and are prescribed in the *Fire and Fuels Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Assessment for Public Lands in New Mexico and Texas* (2004c) and *BLM Manual Section 7000: Soil, Water, and Air Management*. Under all alternatives, air resources would be managed as prescribed by existing and applicable air quality laws. Mitigation of impacts to air resources would be developed on a case-by-case basis through the NEPA process to prevent and reduce air quality impacts from activities on public land. Dust abatement stipulations would be included as part of permits or contracts on public land or for Federally-sponsored activities where air quality could significantly be affected.

2.4.3.2 SOIL AND WATER

This section primarily addresses soil and water resources on a watershed basis. Watersheds contain multiple parameters such as soil type, topography, precipitation events, vegetation, and surface and ground water that function in unison across the landscape. Manipulation or alteration of any one of these parameters can change the watershed's function or condition. Goals, objectives, and proposed alternatives for soil and water resources are proposed on a watershed scale.

Goals:

- Protect and restore natural ecosystems and the environment while managing for sustainable economic and social development, avoiding adverse impacts to natural ecosystems wherever possible, and fully mitigating any unavoidable impacts.
- Protect and restore soil and hydrologic conditions, on both site-specific areas and a watershed basis, to meet ecological site capabilities in a manner that promotes natural hydrological processes and enhances natural resources.
- Maintain or improve the integrity of streams and their associated riparian values on public land.
- Ensure that surface water and ground water influenced by BLM activities comply with or are making significant progress toward achieving State of New Mexico water quality standards consistent with the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) and the U.S. Environmental Protections Agency (EPA).

Objectives:

- Develop and analyze soil and water resources and associated projects based on sound science, increased consideration of both monetary and non-monetary benefits to justify and select a project or action, and consider nonstructural approaches that maximize net economic, environmental, and social benefits.
- Meet or move toward riparian and upland land health standards (Appendix B) to protect and restore watersheds and stream systems and reduce nonpoint source pollution through enhanced soil stability and productivity, increased soil moisture, decreased erosion, stable hydrologic functions, and thriving desired vegetation communities
- Minimize or control elevated levels of nonpoint source pollutants from Federal land to degraded and impaired stream systems, by managing surface land use, where practical and within the scope of the BLM's authority, according to New Mexico Water Quality Rules and Regulations.
- Manage stable, non-stable, and transition areas for desired state and conditions to meet site capability for soil, stability, and hydrologic functions consistent with naturally occurring processes.

2.4.3.2.1 *Soil and Water Continuing Management Guidance*

Controlling soil erosion, sediment movement, and salt contamination of surface water would remain a major management commitment. The BLM would use a variety of tools and applicable planning documents to identify issues and conflicts within watersheds and formulate comprehensive management plans for each impaired watershed. The watershed analyses would be based on the indicators outlined in the *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* (BLM 2001a; Appendix B). To guide this process, the Las Cruces District Office follows Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 4180.1, BLM's *Rangeland Health Standards Handbook*, and *BLM Manual Section 4180: Rangeland Health Standards*. The BLM would remain involved with coordinated

efforts for Watershed Restoration Action Strategies (WRAS) associated with the 319(h) Watershed Restoration Grant through the NMED and the EPA.

The Las Cruces District Office would coordinate with other agencies and water users to assure best management practices are employed for managing water uses. The BLM would continue evaluating and monitoring public land health to make sure that ecological sites are achieving or moving toward their capability, which aids in maintaining or improving water quantity through increased soil moisture, infiltration, and groundwater recharge. The BLM would comply with all water rights regulations for ground water and surface water controlled and administered by the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer.

BLM actions and use authorizations must comply with applicable state and Federal water quality laws, statutes, regulations, standards, and implementation plans. Water quality authority is vested in the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission and is administered primarily by the various units of the NMED and the EPA. The BLM would continue to work with state and Federal agencies in water quality management to ensure that best management practices comply with state water quality standards.

Riparian and upland sites would be managed to meet standards outlined in the New Mexico Standards and Guidelines (see Appendix B). Riparian sites on public land would continue to be assessed to determine if the land is meeting the standards, moving toward the standards, or not achieving the standard. Evaluations of current conditions, impacts, trends, and capabilities of riparian areas would guide management decisions for maintenance and restoration actions in riparian areas. Management practices would be designed and established to meet upland, riparian, and water quality needs. Livestock management activities would be excluded from riparian areas, such as salting, feeding, and construction of holding facilities and stock driveways, unless specifically authorized.

2.4.3.2.2 Soil and Water Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives

Watersheds containing areas where accelerated erosion, runoff, and physical or chemical degradation have resulted in unacceptable soil conditions would be rehabilitated and stabilized. The primary strategies to achieve watershed restoration would focus on implementing actions that support and mimic the natural landscape and hydrologic processes within the capability of the site. The objective would be to move the site toward the upland sites land health standard (see Appendix B). Soils would be stabilized by maintaining appropriate amounts of vegetation and protective litter or rock cover, and decreased surface disturbance. In coordination with other resource programs, emphasis would be placed on meeting the upland sites land health standard. For surface disturbing activities, the use of best management practices would reduce impacts to soil and water resources with an emphasis on achieving and maintaining healthy ecosystems and watersheds.

2.4.3.2.3 Soil and Water Management Direction by Alternative

Alternative A: Continuing efforts to control erosion would include minimizing surface disturbance from construction projects, closure and rehabilitation of unneeded roads, and control of off-road vehicle use in critical areas.

In Doña Ana County, critical soils on 0 percent to 10 percent slopes would be the first priority for land treatments and grazing management to reduce erosion and improve water quality. A second priority would be to manage grazing on critical soils on slopes over 10 percent to reduce erosion and improve water quality. In all surface disturbing actions, continue to incorporate provisions for erosion control. Watershed Management Plans would be developed in the following areas:

- Corralitos, Rincon/Hatch (Doña Ana County)
- The area of Wind and Chess Draws in the Cornudas Mountain (23,000 acres) (Otero County)
- Watersheds east of Tularosa and south of the Tularosa Creek (11,000 acres) (Otero County)
- The Three Rivers watershed north of Tularosa (21,000 acres) (Otero County)
- East of Crow Flats (11,000 acres) (Otero County)
- The Moccasin and Otto Draws southwest of Pinon (7,300 acres) (Otero County)

Alternative B: Under Alternative B, no surface-disturbing activities would be allowed on public land which may result in soil movement and loss within watersheds containing Clean Water Act Section 303(d) listed streams, except for management activities specifically designed to minimize or control nonpoint source pollutants.

Management of soil and water resources and landscape restoration projects would be completed using only passive methods. Examples of passive methods would be altering current management of activities such as grazing, recreation, or rights-of-ways. All surface-disturbing activities having a long-term effect that would alter the natural topography, soil profile, or hydrologic process would be prohibited, except for valid existing rights or mining claims and mineral exploration and development conducted pursuant to regulations at 43 CFR 3809. Any surface disturbing activities determined to only have short-term effects on soil and water resources would be restored to natural pre-construction conditions and re-vegetated.

Alternative C: Under Alternative C, surface-disturbing activities which may result in soil movement and loss within watersheds containing Clean Water Act Section 303(d) listed streams would be allowed provided each activity could be fully mitigated. No surface disturbing activities that may increase the transport of nonpoint source pollutants to an impaired stream would be permitted within 0.25 miles of an impaired stream or any of its tributaries for which an ordinary high water mark could be determined.

Management of soil and water resources and landscape restoration projects would be completed using passive methods (such as altering grazing or recreation use) and active treatments (structural, manual, fire, biological, chemical, and mechanical) to meet and enhance the soil and site stability and hydrologic function to the capability of the site. All surface-disturbing activities having a long-term effect and which would alter the natural topography, soil profile, or hydrologic process would be prohibited from restored vegetation sites, potential vegetation restoration sites, and intact grassland habitats, except for valid existing rights or mining claims and mineral exploration and development conducted pursuant to regulations at 43 CFR 3809. All surface disturbing activities would be reclaimed to natural pre-disturbed conditions and re-vegetated whenever possible.

Alternative D: Under Alternative D, surface disturbing actions would be allowed provided these activities do not contribute to the likelihood of a stream becoming listed; site-specific mitigation would apply to activities near 303(d) streams. Soil and watersheds management and landscape restoration projects would be completed through any reasonable method of restoration to meet the ecological site capability for soil and site stability and the hydrologic function.

2.4.3.3 VEGETATION AND WOODLANDS

Vegetation management within the *Decision Area* is guided overall by the *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* (USDOI BLM 2000). These standards and guidelines are explained in Appendix B and are incorporated as part of this RMP.

Vegetation management and treatment would be aimed at meeting the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. A potential natural community is a stable community with the kind,

proportions, and amounts of plants expected on the site without disturbance under present environmental conditions. Capability is the degree to which the site can produce the kind, proportions, and amounts of plants expected on the site based on the area's history of disturbance.

The woodland vegetation type represents approximately 3 percent of the *Decision Area* vegetation. Much of the woodland type is in wildland-urban interface areas. By definition wildland-urban interface areas in the *Planning Area* include any area where vegetative fuels and human development meet and intermingle. Consequently, woodland management has consisted and would continue to consist primarily of fuels reduction projects in these areas to promote human safety and protection of property.

Goal:

- Manage vegetation on public land in a manner that ensures progress toward achieving the *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*.

Objectives:

- Within priority watersheds, enhance, protect, and restore the diversity of native vegetation in a mosaic of vegetative communities that protect soil and watershed and to provide resources for other multiple uses such as wildlife habitat and livestock grazing.
- Use an integrated pest management approach to control noxious weeds and undesirable invasive species in priority areas.
- Maintain areas that meet desirable state and conditions and improve areas that do not meet desired state and conditions within the ecological site capability.
- Use prescribed fires, mechanical fuels treatments and wildfires to restore ecosystem resilience, structure, and composition on degraded BLM land to resemble pre-settlement conditions.

2.4.3.3.1 *Vegetation and Woodlands Continuing Management Guidance*

All BLM activities are expected to meet the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines*. These standards describe the conditions needed for healthy public land under three categories: upland sites, biotic communities, and riparian sites. In accordance with BLM policy, the Las Cruces District Office must evaluate activities on public land against indicators developed for each standard. All programs and activities should be managed to ensure that standards are being met or areas are moving towards the standards. See Appendix B for an explanation of the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines*.

Natural recovery by native plant species is preferable to planting or seeding when considering restoration, rehabilitation, or reclamation of disturbed areas. In compliance with E.O.13112, BLM Handbook 1740-2, and BLM Manual 1745, and subject to future revisions to Bureau policy and guidance, where restoration, rehabilitation, or reclamation efforts (including any and all BLM authorized and BLM initiated actions such as rights-of way, fluid minerals reclamation, rangeland restoration projects, and fire stabilization and rehab projects) require reseeding or use of other plant materials (such as potted plants, poles, etc.), native plant materials will be given first consideration. Locally adapted source identified material, selections, varieties, or cultivars of native species will be used to the maximum extent possible to improve project success and maintain plant community integrity. Prior to considering the use of non-native/exotic plant materials, consider using suitable native plant materials from alternate community states or nearby communities. In limited circumstances, the use of non-native plant materials may be authorized to achieve specific objectives.

Non-native/exotic plant materials may only be considered for use in situations where:

1. Seeds or plants of suitable native species are not available,
2. The natural biological diversity of the proposed management area will not be diminished,
3. Non-native/exotic species can be confined within the proposed management area,
4. Analysis of ecological site inventory information indicates that a site will not support reestablishment of a species that historically was part of the landscape and,
5. Resource management objectives cannot be met with native species.

In cases where the use of non-native/exotic plant materials is desired, a justification including identification of any desired native species that is not available, and a detailed environmental analysis will be submitted for approval by the State Director. The Plant Conservation Program and partner organizations, will work to identify and develop native replacements for any non-native/exotic plant species approved for use on public land.

The Las Cruces District Office Weed Management Program focuses on inventorying existing infestations, preventing noxious weed invasion, monitoring revegetation efforts for invasive weeds, and assessing the success of weed control efforts. The program is guided by executive order and Federal and State laws.

Vegetation management and treatment activities would give full consideration to the management of pollinators. This includes implementation of vegetation treatment standard operating procedures in Appendix B of the 2007 Vegetation Treatment EIS, other measures outlined in BLM Information Bulletin 2009-011, its supporting documentation, and any subsequent policy and guidance developed.

Woodland management would be through the fire management program to manage the use of fire in the woodland ecosystems to achieve resource goals. The program for the Las Cruces District Office would be driven primarily by ecological objectives while promoting economic and social benefits.

2.4.3.3.2 *Vegetation and Woodlands Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Vegetation communities may be restored using passive methods, active methods or a combination of both. Passive treatment methods are primarily restrictions of uses such as reducing or closing an area to grazing, reducing OHV use, or preventing soil disturbance from mineral development. Active treatment methods include: manual, such as cutting individual trees or shrubs; fire, natural and prescribed; biological; chemical; and mechanical.

An integrated approach would be used and coordinated with other Federal and local government agencies to inventory, identify, and eradicate noxious weeds and invasive species.

American Indian groups often use native plants or plant material in various ceremonial events. These plants are generally found on public land. Consequently, free-use permits would be authorized for collection of plants or plant material to be used in ceremonial or religious events and observances.

2.4.3.3.3 *Vegetation and Woodlands Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Grass bottomlands, mixed desert shrub (>10 percent slope), snakeweed, and mountain brush vegetation types would be treated using a combination of prescribed burning, prescribed wild fire, and prescribed grazing management. Creosotebush, mesquite, and desert shrub (<10 percent slope) would be treated almost entirely by use of chemical herbicides. Chemicals would not be used on areas over 10 percent slopes and within ½-mile of a perennial stream.

All areas treated by prescribed burning or prescribed wild fire, or chemical herbicides would be rested from grazing for at least two growing seasons in areas where livestock use occurs, unless otherwise authorized.

Vegetation sale areas would be retained until a minimum is reached where the amount of residual vegetation left is sufficient for natural regeneration. Sale areas would be expanded into adjacent lands identified for disposal.

Alternatives B, C & D: Woodland management projects would be conducted using active methods including mechanical and fire treatments to reduce fuels build-up, minimize fire potential in the wildland urban interface, and improve ecological health of woodlands.

Alternative B: Vegetation communities on areas needing restoration would be treated using passive methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Any vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved for watershed function and wildlife.

The NMDGF maintains a list of key habitats of special status species (e.g., Chihuahuan desert grasslands, piñon-juniper, riparian, desert shrubs) in its *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy*. The BLM would place emphasis on enhancing ecological sites within these key habitats by managing transition and other stable-state areas for desired state and conditions to meet ecological site potential.

Integrated management techniques (excluding fire, mechanical, and chemical treatments) would be used to manage noxious weeds and invasive species.

Vegetation sales including commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products would be allowed only in project areas where vegetation would be removed, such as a pipeline or road.

Alternative C: Vegetation communities and areas needing restoration would be treated using a combination of passive and active methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved to meet the needs of watershed function. Vegetation in excess of those needs would be available to wildlife and livestock, with wildlife receiving priority over livestock. However, there would be no increase in grazing preference as a result of vegetation increases.

To meet ecological site capability, transitioning areas and stable state and condition areas would be managed for a desired state and condition.

The BLM would place emphasis on enhancing ecological sites within the NMDGF key habitats by managing transition and other stable-state areas for the desired state. Integrated management techniques (including fire, mechanical, and chemical treatments) would be used to manage noxious weeds and invasive species.

Permits for vegetation sales would be in areas designated for disposal or in utility and right-of-way corridors where vegetation would be otherwise removed. Commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products would be allowed where appropriate to meet management objectives.

Alternative D: Vegetation communities and areas needing restoration would be treated using active methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Vegetation in excess of those needs would be available to wildlife and livestock with neither having priority over the other. In any case there would be no increase in grazing preference as a result of vegetation increases.

Transitioning areas would be managed for a desired state and condition to meet ecological site capability.

Integrated management techniques (including fire, mechanical, and chemical treatments) would be used to manage noxious weeds and invasive species.

Permits for vegetation sale would be authorized in areas designated for disposal or in utility and right-of-way corridors where vegetation would be otherwise removed. Commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products would be allowed where appropriate to meet management objectives.

2.4.3.4 WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT

Section 102.8 of FLPMA requires that public land be managed to protect the quality of multiple resources and to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. Rangeland health policies reiterate the need to foster productive and diverse populations and communities of plants and animals.

The BLM manages wildlife habitat on public land and the NMDGF manages the wildlife populations. This requires a close working relationship between the two agencies in managing a variety of projects, habitats and species.

Goal:

- In cooperation with NMDGF, manage public land to provide sufficient quantity and quality of wildlife habitat and to maintain or enhance wildlife populations and biological diversity.

Objectives:

Protect, enhance, and where appropriate, restore native fish and wildlife, and fish and wildlife habitats by the following:

- Managing public land to attain the biotic, riparian, and upland standards for public land health (*New Mexico Standards and Guidelines*).
- Managing for Species of Greatest Conservation Need and Key Habitats identified in the NMDGF's *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy*.
- Implementing BLM Habitat Management Plans (HMPs) or other cooperatively developed Federal, state, or local activity plans and fish and wildlife habitat projects consistent with habitat management goals and objectives.
- Managing public land to allow for reintroductions, transplants, and augmentations of native fish and wildlife populations in coordination with the NMDGF or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, consistent with applicable agency policies and habitat and population management plan goals.
- Maintaining and restoring habitat connectivity in and between public land including breeding, foraging, dispersal, and seasonal use habitats.

2.4.3.4.1 *Wildlife and Fish Continuing Management Guidance*

The BLM is primarily responsible for protecting and improving fish and wildlife habitat on public land according to the FLPMA and U.S. Department of Interior Policy (43 CFR Part 24.4). Resident fish and wildlife species are managed by the NMDGF. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), No. NMSO-41, between the BLM and the NMDGF provides for the cooperative development of fish and wildlife resource plans, sets forth responsibilities for coordination, identifies issues of concern, and establishes methods of coordination. The BLM will continue to cooperate under the terms of the MOU. The BLM

will continue with the New Mexico Habitat Stamp Program in coordination with NMDGF. This is a process authorized under the Sikes Act (Public Law 93-452) and establishes a mechanism to fund projects and programs for the conservation, rehabilitation, and ecological diversification of fish and wildlife habitats on land administered by the Forest Service and BLM. The BLM will also continue to closely cooperate with NMDGF on the restoration of desert bighorn sheep.

Animal damage control on BLM-administered land is conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal Plant Health Inspection Services-Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) in accordance with a National Memorandum of Understanding between APHIS-WS and the BLM. The U.S. Department of the Interior policy and annual *Work Plan for Predator Damage Management on Public Lands Administered by the BLM* for Las Cruces District Office prepared jointly by the APHIS-WS and the BLM, guide animal damage control activities on public land within the *Planning Area*. The APHIS-WS has overall responsibility for the specific control actions on public land.

Proposed activities would be analyzed to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Executive Order 13186, and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. The MBTA of 1918 prohibits the take, capture or killing of any migratory birds, any parts, nest or eggs of any such bird (16 U.S.C. 703 (a)). In addition, Executive Order 13186 (January 2001) requires the BLM to ensure MBTA compliance, evaluate Bureau actions and agency plans on migratory birds, initiate actions to minimize take of migratory birds and contribute to the conservation of migratory birds. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act limits the take of bald and golden eagles where the take to be authorized is associated with otherwise lawful activities.

Specific guidance for proposed actions in all alternatives would include consideration of:

- Habitat and population objectives from the New Mexico Partners In Flight Plan, and NMDGF *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy*, to maintain, restore, or enhance the habitat of migratory birds.
- Desired habitat conditions or population for habitat types that support a variety of game, non-game, and migratory bird species, acknowledging the state's role in managing fish and wildlife.
- Actions and area-wide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions while maintaining a natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships for area-specific bird conservation opportunities.
- In coordination with USFWS identify best management practices for or categories of actions to avoid or minimize unintentional take of migratory birds as well as measures aimed at conserving migratory bird habitats and populations (see Appendix D).
- The biotic and riparian standards included in the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* provide management guidance for fish and wildlife habitats.

2.4.3.4.2 *Wildlife and Fish Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Under all alternatives, the BLM would continue to implement existing HMPs and Coordinated Resource Management Plans (CRMPs) to improve terrestrial and riparian wildlife habitats: Jornada Del Muerto HMP (Sierra and Doña Ana counties); Robledo Mountains HMP; Organ/Franklin Mountain CRMP; and Riparian HMP (See Map 2-1). Additional HMPs would be developed as needed under all alternatives.

Fish and wildlife, and fish and wildlife habitat would continue to be considered and evaluated during site-specific planning for all types of projects and public rights-of-way. Stipulations developed through consultation with the NMDGF for each project would become part of project authorizations. The BLM

would ensure that public rights-of-way are consistent with attainment or making significant progress toward attainment of the New Mexico Public Land Health Standards for biotic and riparian habitats.

Lands identified for disposal would be a low priority for habitat management, unless site-specific analysis determines that changes in the existing situation have resulted in higher resource values that would warrant retention of these lands to protect fish and wildlife values consistent with existing laws, regulation, or policy.

Riparian areas would not be identified for disposal, unless such a disposal is in the public interest. An example would be exchange of a low-quality riparian habitat for a higher-quality riparian habitat.

Habitat management actions and other discretionary public land uses would be authorized consistent with approved BLM HMPs, NMDGF population or conservation plans, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies or NMDGF species or habitat management guidelines, cooperatively developed Federal, state, or local activity plans, and other habitat and wildlife corridor data from the Western Governors Association Wildlife Council Interagency Crucial Habitat Assessment Tool (CHAT).

The transplant, augmentation, and establishment of native and naturalized exotic fish, wildlife, and plant species and the introduction of exotic species on public land would be consistent with *BLM Manual Section 1745: Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife and Plants*.

The BLM would use species of greatest conservation need and key habitats identified in the NMDGF *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico*, existing BLM HMPs, or other cooperatively developed Federal, State, or local, activity plans to prioritize watersheds for assessment in accordance with the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* and to develop future HMPs or other appropriate activity plans to protect or enhance fish and wildlife habitats.

The watershed analysis process would determine if attainment or significant progress is being made toward the achievement of the biotic and riparian standards for public land health. Restoration strategies, including appropriate changes in existing management, would be developed and implemented to address the causal factors identified as contributing to terrestrial and aquatic/riparian habitat degradation.

Best management practices and standard operating procedures would be implemented where needed and applicable to wildlife and fisheries habitat management (see Appendix D).

2.4.3.4.3 *Wildlife and Fish Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: The BLM would seek to attain biotic and other public land health standards through emphasizing management of key habitats identified by the NMDGF *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico* and through implementing existing HMPs, developing new HMPs, and managing the protections afforded by existing ACECs.

An HMP would be developed for Percha Creek, Caballo Mountains, West Potrillo Mountains, Sacramento Mountains, and Otero Mesa.

Riparian habitats would be managed according to applicable BLM guidance and decisions. Riparian habitat management would be coordinated with other programs and activities as needed, particularly range, wildlife habitat, watershed, recreation, and lands management.

Forage for 354 mule deer that presently utilize habitats within Sierra County would be provided. Forage would be provided for an estimated population increase of 261 deer by 2010. In addition, forage for 195

pronghorn that presently utilize habitat within Sierra County and for an estimated addition of 475 pronghorn would be provided.

Forage for 12,588 mule deer and 1,666 pronghorn (optimum numbers) would be provided in herd unit areas in the long-term (30,234 and 2,582 AUMs respectively, for a total of 32,816 AUMs). This represents an increase from the 1993 numbers of 5,955 mule deer (14,281 AUMs) and 731 pronghorn (1,247 AUMs).

Priority big game species objectives and population goals by area would be as follows:

Robledo Mountains	Mule Deer:	400
	Pronghorn Antelope:	50
Las Uvas Mountains	Mule Deer:	300
West Potrillo Mountains	Mule Deer:	300
Organ/Franklin Mountains	Mule Deer:	500
	Desert Bighorn Sheep:	100

Alternative B, C, and D: Management for mule deer, pronghorn, elk, and desert bighorn sheep habitats would be emphasized consistent with attainment of NMDGF population management goals and objectives.

Alternatives B & C: Biotic and other public land health standards would be attained through emphasizing management of key habitats identified by the NMDGF *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico*; and through implementing existing HMPs, developing new HMPs, and managing the protections afforded by existing ACECs and new ACEC designations.

Any vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved for watershed function and wildlife.

New land uses would be restricted and, where possible, existing land uses would be modified in riparian habitats in order to achieve proper functioning conditions while restoring and protecting riparian and aquatic ecosystems and restoring plant community structure and composition to meet site potential or site capability.

Desert bighorn sheep habitat would be managed consistent with attainment of population management goals and objectives for all occupied and potentially suitable habitat identified in the NMDGF *Desert Bighorn Sheep Recovery Plan*, as updated or amended, and other suitable habitat where no conflicts with domestic sheep/goat grazing permits or exotic species managed by the NMDGF exist.

No emphasis would be placed on habitat management for non-native species (e.g., oryx, barbary sheep).

Alternative C: Vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved to meet the needs of watershed function. Vegetation in excess of those needs would be available to wildlife and livestock, with wildlife receiving priority over livestock.

Desert bighorn sheep habitat management objectives would be consistent with attaining the NMDGF population management goals and objectives for currently occupied and potentially suitable habitat identified in the NMDGF *Desert Bighorn Sheep Recovery Plan*, as updated or amended. Other suitable habitat pioneered by bighorn sheep would be managed similarly if there are no conflicts with domestic sheep/goat grazing, or exotic species managed by the NMDGF. Bighorn sheep habitat management

emphasis for the herd areas in the Sacramento and Guadalupe Mountains would be deferred until issues regarding domestic sheep and goat grazing and nonnative species are resolved.

Habitat for nonnative species would be consistent with the NMDGF management goals and consistent with the attainment of public land health standards.

Alternative D: Biotic and other public land health standards would be attained through continuing to implement existing HMPs, developing new HMPs, and managing protections afforded by existing ACECs.

Any vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatment would not be reserved to meet wildlife needs.

Riparian habitats would be managed according to applicable BLM guidance and decisions to achieve the minimum standard of proper functioning condition to meet the needs of aquatic species, including nonnative species.

Desert bighorn sheep habitat would be managed consistent with attaining the NMDGF population management goals and objectives for the Organ Mountains and Caballo Mountains herd areas.

Habitat management for nonnative species (e.g., oryx, Barbary sheep) would seek to maintain or increase populations to meet the public hunting demand in coordination with the NMDGF and consistent with attaining public land health standards.

2.4.3.5 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

Section 102.8 of FLPMA requires that public land be managed to protect the quality of multiple resources and to provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates management that leads to the conservation and recovery of Federally-listed threatened or endangered species. Bureau sensitive species are species that require special management consideration to avoid potential future listing under the ESA and that have been identified in accordance with procedures set forth in *BLM Manual 6840: Special Status Species Management*.

BLM special status species consists of: species listed as endangered or threatened under the ESA and BLM sensitive species (which includes proposed or candidate species for ESA listing, and delisted species within 5 years of delisting). BLM sensitive species would be managed consistent with species and habitat management objectives in land use and implementation plans to promote their conservation and to minimize the likelihood and need for listing under the ESA.

Goal:

- Manage public land to restore, maintain or improve habitats that lead to the recovery of Federally-listed species populations and preclude the need for Federally-listing proposed, candidate, state protected, or sensitive species.

Objectives:

- Ensure appropriate management, protections, and mitigations are developed and applied by continuing to monitor and inventory special status animal and plant species and their habitats.
- Utilize key habitats identified in the NMDGF's *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy*, along with other resource values and concerns to assist in the prioritization of watersheds for assessment and determination of public land health standards or the development of management plans designed to protect or enhance habitat for special status species.
- Over the life of this RMP, achieve no net loss of special status species habitats within the *Decision Area*.

2.4.3.5.1 *Special Status Species Continuing Management Guidance*

In accordance with *BLM Manual Section 6840*, special status species should be managed to the level of protection required under the ESA, or for BLM sensitive species, to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out by the BLM do not contribute to the need to Federally list those species.

State laws protecting state listed species apply to all BLM programs and actions to the extent that they are consistent with Federal authority. Applicable state legislation in the *Planning Area* is shown in Appendix A. In accordance with these laws, lists of species that require protective measures are maintained by the state. Key habitats for special status species would be identified by the NMDGF's *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico*.

The BLM would consider special status species habitat needs, species of greatest conservation need and key habitats identified in the *Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico*, existing HMPs, and other cooperatively developed Federal, state, or local activity plans to prioritize watersheds for assessment according to the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* and to develop future HMPs or other appropriate activity plans to protect and enhance special status species habitat.

Management actions authorized or carried out by the BLM would be consistent with the recovery and conservation goals and objectives outlined in any applicable USFWS recovery plans, special status species conservation plans, and BLM HMPs. Prior to authorizing any surface-disturbing activity the BLM prepares an appropriate environmental document in which potential impacts to special status species are analyzed and mitigation is planned if necessary, to avoid or reduce potential adverse impacts to these species or their habitats.

The transplant, augmentation, and establishment of native and naturalized exotic fish, wildlife, and plant species and populations and the introduction of exotic species on public land would be consistent with *BLM Manual Section 1745: Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife and Plants*.

2.4.3.5.2 *Special Status Species Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

In order to protect Federally-listed endangered and threatened and BLM sensitive species, site-specific evaluations and clearances during the NEPA process would be required and more stringent management prescriptions would be applied in areas that have been specially designated to protect target species. Any action that may affect Federally-listed species or species proposed for listing would also require consultation or conferencing, respectively, with the USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA.

A model has been developed by the NMSU Cooperative Wildlife Conservation Unit and the BLM to predict potential habitat for the Federally-endangered northern aplomado falcon (Young et al., 2002), now

designated as a non-essential experimental population. Grazing allotments within areas identified as potential aplomado falcon habitat would be managed for a stable or increasing trend in range condition or desired plant community within the capability of the ecological sites. Areas of high value or core habitat as shown by the aplomado falcon habitat model would be managed to minimize potential impacts from surface disturbing activities.

The BLM would implement the following management actions as well as standard operating procedures and best management practices described in the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* (see Appendix B) to ensure the protection of special status species:

- Comply with recovery plans for threatened or endangered species and conservation plans for candidate species, as well as BLM guidance for sensitive species.
- Prohibit disturbance within 0.25 miles of known raptor nests, prairie dog towns and other special status species habitats. Apply seasonal closures or use restrictions in specific areas, as necessary, to protect special status species, while allowing for compatible uses.

2.4.3.5.3 *Special Status Species Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternatives A & D: The following existing ACECs would continue to be managed to protect special status species plant or animal habitat:

EXISTING ACECS	ACRES
Cornudas Mountain	852
Alamo Mountain	2,528
Wind Mountain	2,308
Alkali Lakes	6,348
Sacramento Escarpment	4,474
Organ/Franklin ACEC	58,417
TOTAL	74,927

Alternatives A, C and D: Surface disturbing activities would be relocated up to 0.25 miles away from known populations of special status species.

Alternatives B and C: The Las Cruces District Office would cooperate with the USFWS regarding the release of aplomado falcons within suitable habitat within the *Decision Area* in accordance with Section 10(j) of the ESA.

Aplomado falcon releases would continue as part of the effort to reestablish viable populations under the 10(j) rule of the ESA. Vegetation restoration areas considered moderate to high potential falcon habitat (Young et al., 2002) would be priority areas for releases.

Alternative B: Existing ACECs and the following proposed ACECs would be designated and managed, in part, for the protection of special status plant or animal species habitat (see Map 2-3):

PROPOSED ACECS	ACRES
Brokeoff Mountain	61,224
Pup Canyon	3,677
Sacramento Mountain	2,381
Six Shooter Canyon	1,060
Tularosa Creek	236
Otero Mesa Grassland	271,262
East Potrillo	11,460
Tortugas Mountain	1,936
Mud Mountain	2,579
Percha Creek	870
TOTAL	356,685

Surface disturbing activities would be relocated a minimum of 0.5 miles away from known populations of special status species plants subject to valid existing rights. Other restrictions would be imposed on a site specific basis where necessary to avoid impacts to a plant population.

Electrical powerlines and towers would be located at least 2 miles away from occupied prairie dog habitat in order to reduce predation by raptors.

Alternative C: Existing ACECs (in Alternative A) and the following proposed ACECs would be designated and managed, in part, for the protection of special status plant or animal species (Map 2-4):

PROPOSED ACECS	ACRES
Brokeoff Mountain	3,971
Pup Canyon	3,677
Sacramento Mountains	2,381
Six Shooter Canyon	1,060
Otero Mesa Grassland	198,511
Mud Mountain	2,579
Percha Creek	870
Van Winkle Lake	1,320
TOTAL	214,369

Alternative D: No releases of aplomado falcons would be allowed within suitable habitats on public land under Section 10(j) of the ESA. The BLM would no longer participate in the falcon restoration program.

Existing ACECs in Alternative A would be managed to protect, in part, special status species habitat. No new ACECs would be designated for the protection of special status plant or animal species habitat.

2.4.3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The BLM is required by law, regulations, and executive orders to manage cultural resources in such a way that they would be preserved and protected from destruction, and that appropriate uses would be made of such resources. Laws, regulations, and executive orders require that such management be coordinated with the appropriate American Indian tribes and individuals.

Cultural resources management in the Las Cruces District Office involves meeting the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as well as pro-active obligations under Section 110 and other authorities such as field schools for site digs, rock art inventories, and interpretation of historic sites including El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, Lake Valley and other sites.

Goals:

- Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations per FLPMA of 1976, Sections 103(c) and 201(a) and (c); National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Section 110(a); Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14(a).
- Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses per FLPMA Section 103(c), and NHPA Sections 106 and 110(a) (2) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use would comply with the NHPA Section 106 and other pertinent laws, regulations, and policies.

Objectives:

- Protect and preserve a representative sample of significant cultural resources on public land for present and future generations.
- Allocate all cultural resources both known and projected to occur to one or more of the six use-location categories as prescribed by the cultural resource program and manage accordingly.

2.4.3.6.1 *Cultural Resources Continuing Management Guidance*

The BLM complies with numerous Federal laws, regulations, executive orders, and other directives regarding cultural resources and historic preservation (see Appendix A). The requirement to appropriately manage cultural resources was incorporated into FLPMA. This law remains the primary basis for BLM's program for managing cultural resources in conjunction with the agency's mandate to promote multiple, sustainable uses of resources on public land.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) stipulates that Federal agencies give due consideration to historic properties (e.g., resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places) as Federal undertakings are planned and implemented. Regulations for Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR 800) define a process for consulting with State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other interested organizations and individuals. In 1997, the BLM negotiated a National Programmatic Agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers regarding the manner in which the BLM would comply with the NHPA. This was amended in 2012. The National Programmatic Agreement is implemented through a state-specific protocol negotiated with the New Mexico SHPO.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act and its implementing regulations (43 CFR 296) give the BLM the permitting authority to restrict access to archaeological resources on public land and specifies that such permits can only be issued for scholarly research or resource preservation. Human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony affiliated with American Indians are sometimes associated with archaeological sites. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act stipulates how such remains and objects on Federal land are to be treated.

The BLM applies a “*rule of reason*” in considering how potential effects of BLM actions on cultural resources would be considered on non-Federal land, as directed by *BLM Manual* Section 8100.07 and the National Programmatic Agreement. Under this policy, the BLM inventories, evaluates, and assesses potential effects on cultural resources on nonpublic land to the extent that effects stem from BLM decisions. These situations may arise for linear projects that cross land of various jurisdictions, including public land, or issuance of permits to drill on split-estate land. Cross-jurisdictional activities also may be subject to the New Mexico Cultural Properties Act, which addresses cultural resources on State trust land.

2.4.3.6.2 *Cultural Resources Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

The BLM would cooperate with the National Park Service (NPS) and other agencies, Instituto Nacional de Anthropología e Historia de Mexico (INAH), interested parties, and landowners in protecting and interpreting El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail in accordance with *El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan* (USDOI BLM 2004a). Butterfield Trail stage station sites would be acquired through land exchanges or purchases from willing sellers.

The corridor and associated VRM Class II area for El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro across the Jornada del Muerto in Sierra County would continue to be managed according Comprehensive Management Plan with the exception of Visual Resources, which are described below.

2.4.3.6.3 *Cultural Resource Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted within ¼-mile of well-preserved segments of the Butterfield Trail (2,200 acres) (see Map 2-22); a cultural resource management plan would be prepared for the Trail. The following ACECs would continue to be managed in part to protect cultural resources:

EXISTING ACECS	ACRES
Cornudas Mountain	852
Alamo Mountain	2,528
Wind Mountain	2,308
Three Rivers Petroglyph Site	1,043
Doña Ana Mountains	1,427
Los Tules	24
Rincon	856
Organ/Franklin Mountains	58,417
San Diego	623
TOTAL	68,078

Alternatives B, C, and D: Depending on availability of funding and personnel, under Alternatives B, C, and D, the Las Cruces District would prepare one or more cultural resource activity plans that would provide more specific direction to the program. These activity plans would address such program issues as priorities and emphasis of the Cultural Resources program for the future, determining use allocations and decisions to further the goals and objectives outlined above, and survey work, stabilization and preservation programs that would be pursued in the program.

The Butterfield and the Mormon Battalion historic trails would be managed to preserve their integrity for future generations and possible designation as National Historic Trails.

Alternative B: Surface disturbing activities within a ½-mile of well-preserved segments of the following historic trails would not be permitted (Map 2-23). Well-preserved segments are those which the BLM and others have been able to identify on-the-ground.

- El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro
- Butterfield Trail
- Mormon Battalion Trail

Existing ACECs (in Alternative A) and the following proposed ACECs shown would be managed in part to protect cultural resources:

PROPOSED ACECS	ACRES
Brokeoff Mountain	61,224
Sacramento Mountains	2,381
Broad Canyon	4,721
Picacho Peak	950
Tortugas Mountain	1,936
Southern Caballo Mountains	24,117
TOTAL	95,329

Alternative C: Surface disturbing activities would be managed in order to keep the historic setting intact along well-preserved segments of the following historic trails (Map 2-24):

- El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro
- Butterfield Trail
- Mormon Battalion Trail

Well-preserved segments are those which the BLM and others have been able to identify on-the-ground.

Existing ACECs (in Alternative A) and the following ACECs would be managed in part to protect cultural resources.

PROPOSED ACECS	ACRES
Brokeoff Mountain	3,971
Sacramento Mountains	2,381
TOTAL	6,352

Alternative D: Surface disturbance activities would not be permitted within a ¼-mile of well-preserved segments of the three historic trails (see Map 2-25). Well-preserved segments are those which the BLM and others have been able to identify on-the-ground.

No new ACECs would be designated to protect cultural resources. The existing ACECs in Alternative A would be managed in part to protect cultural resources.

2.4.3.7 PALEONTOLOGY

Paleontological resources are any fossilized remains, traces, or imprints of organisms, preserved in or on the earth's crust, that are of paleontological interest and that provide information about the history of life on earth. The Paleontological Resources Preservation Act (PRPA) directs the BLM to manage, protect, and preserve paleontological resources using scientific principles and expertise. Body and bone fossils,

shells of marine creatures, petrified wood, and trace fossils such as tracks and trackways and impressions of plant parts are the principal types of evidence about ancient life found on public land in the *Decision Area*. Paleontology borders between biology and geology, and shares with archaeology a number of similarities.

Goal:

- Preserve, protect, and manage paleontological resources on public land for their scientific, educational, and recreational values in accordance with the PRPA and BLM policy and guidelines.

Objectives:

- Evaluate impacts to paleontological resources on a project-specific basis with consideration of the following information: paleontological sensitivity mapping, known resources of the project area, and extent and type of surface and subsurface disturbance.
- Facilitate the protection, storage, and preservation of fossils discovered or collected on BLM lands.

2.4.3.7.1 *Paleontology Continuing Management Guidance*

The PRPA is the new legal authority for the BLM for the management, protection, and preservation of paleontological resources using scientific principles and expertise. It authorizes collection of any paleontological resources from public land for scientific research with a permit or common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources without a permit as casual collection. It provides for the curation of paleontological resources collected under permit from public land and requires confidentiality of locality data. It provides new criminal and civil penalties for the prosecution of fossil theft and vandalism, prohibits commercial sale, and illegal transport or export. The PRPA requires a program for public awareness and education of the importance of paleontological resources from public land as well as the inventory of Federal lands for paleontological resources. FLPMA requires that public land be managed in a manner that protects the quality of scientific and other values. Paleontological resources will continue to be mitigated under FLPMA and NEPA. The PRPA requires the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations under the PRPA. But, not all sections of the PRPA need regulations to be in full force and effect. Until such time the regulations are finalized and new policy and guidelines are issued, guidelines for management of paleontological resources (fossil resources) in BLM Manual Section 8270 and in the BLM's General Procedural Guidance for Paleontological Resource Management Handbook will continue to be followed.

The objective of the BLM's paleontological resource management program is to provide a consistent and comprehensive approach in all aspects, including identification, evaluation, protection, and use of paleontological resources. Significant paleontological resources are defined by BLM policy to include all vertebrate fossil remains (body and trace fossils) and those plant and invertebrate fossils determined to be scientifically unique on a case-by-case basis.

To estimate the approximate number of fossils within the *Planning Area*, the BLM uses a predictive model based on the potential of exposed rock units to yield significant fossils. The model, based on the geology and known occurrences of fossil resources, is called the Potential Fossil Yield Classification. The BLM New Mexico State Office has an assistance agreement with the New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science (NMMNHS), a State of New Mexico Museum, to ensure the care, protection, and storage of paleontological resources collected from public land in New Mexico discovered in the

course of land use activities. The paleontologists at the NMMNHS hold permits that are required to collect vertebrate fossils and other material from public land across the state.

2.4.3.7.2 *Paleontology Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

To ensure scientific use of significant fossils, permits would be issued by the BLM New Mexico State Office to qualified individuals for the scientific and education collection of paleontological resources including vertebrates and non-vertebrates. Under all alternatives, the BLM would continue to use existing partnerships and information collected from the paleontological collection permits to evaluate the importance of specific areas in the *Decision Area*. To facilitate the protection, storage, and preservation of fossils discovered or collected on BLM land, the BLM would continue to work cooperatively with the NMMNHS vertebrate paleontologists to collect and curate important material to the standards outlined in *USDI Departmental Manual 411*.

To evaluate impacts on significant paleontological resources, the Potential Fossil Yield Classification would be used to develop management recommendations for site-specific land use actions. To provide for educational and recreational values, public outreach material would be available at the Las Cruces District Office. Under all alternatives, the BLM would work to provide public access to significant paleontological resources to local museums and educational facilities for display and interpretation of fossils as a component of regional natural history.

Paleontological resources discovered or collected on public land within the *Decision Area* would be used for scientific purposes and public outreach, including notifications and information on “discovery” procedures.

The Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 established the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument which encompasses the Paleozoic Trackways Research Natural Area (RNA). The RNA designation would be rescinded and the trackways would be managed according to the enabling legislation under all alternatives until such time as a stand-alone RMP is developed for the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument as required by the legislation.

2.4.3.7.3 *Paleontology Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Paleontological resources in Doña Ana County would be managed through the issuance of scientific permits.

Alternatives A and B: The BLM would require field surveys and a mitigation plan for paleontological resources to be done by a BLM-qualified paleontologist for paleontological resources for any land-disturbing activity in Class 3, 4 or 5 areas of paleo-sensitivity.

Alternatives A, B, and C: Areas within the Camp Rice Formation and other Santa Fe Group Formations in the Robledo Mountains would be evaluated for potential for important new discoveries.

Alternative B: Excavation or removal of paleontological resources in WSAs, ACECs, or other areas with sensitive resources would not be authorized.

Outreach and interpretation of paleontological resources *in situ* would be conducted where appropriate.

Alternatives B, C, and D: A notification procedure for permits issued for surface-disturbing activities occurring in paleo-sensitive areas would be set up.

Mitigation measures for surface disturbing activities would be developed and applied as needed to protect paleontological resources, including a controlled surface-use stipulation for leases.

Alternative C: Authorizations for excavation and removal of paleontological resources would be considered where appropriate. Adequate protection, storage, and curation of paleontological resources would be required with emphasis on both scientific and educational uses both *in situ* and off-site.

Alternative D: Field surveys and a mitigation plan for paleontological resources would be required to be done by a BLM-qualified paleontologist for paleontological resources for any land-disturbing activity in Class 4 or 5 areas of paleo-sensitivity.

Develop and implement mitigation measures to protect paleontological resource. Mitigation could include a controlled surface-use stipulation for leases.

2.4.3.8 VISUAL RESOURCES

Section 102.8 of FLPMA declares that public land will be managed to protect the quality of scenic values and where appropriate to preserve and protect certain public land in its natural condition. In order to accomplish this, the BLM uses the Visual Resource Inventory process and Visual Resource Management classes as detailed in Appendix L. The establishment of VRM classes on public land is based on an evaluation of the landscape's scenic qualities, public sensitivity toward certain areas (special designations and WSAs), and the location of affected land from major travel corridors or distance zones.

Goal:

- Maintain the regional scenic beauty, open space landscape, undisturbed views, and other high-quality visual resources compatible with multiple-use management.

Objectives:

- To minimize the visual impacts and contrast against the landscape, including impacts on the night sky, for all actions permitted on public land.
- To ensure management activities and approved land uses are consistent with, and meet, the established VRM class objectives.

2.4.3.8.1 *Visual Resources Continuing Management Guidance*

The BLM has developed a comprehensive system for VRM for the purpose of carrying prescribed visual management objectives and preserving the natural scenic quality of Federal land. *BLM Manual Section 8400: Visual Resource Management* describes BLM's responsibility to identify and protect visual values on all land administered by the BLM. The BLM accomplishes this through a VRM system that follows the management guidelines in *BLM Manual Section 8400* and other policy guidance. In the VRM system, VRM classes are assigned to accommodate management or use of other resources including, but not limited to, visual resources. The VRM class designations are management decisions regarding the level of visual resource protection to be employed in maintaining the scenic quality on a specific landscape or area of public land.

2.4.3.8.2 *Visual Resources Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

VRM class designations have been proposed on all land within the BLM's *Decision Area* under all alternatives. More restrictive visual management requirements would not be retroactively applied to existing projects or ground disturbances. Contrast ratings (VRM compliance) would be required for all future projects in highly sensitive areas, and for projects with the potential for high visual impacts. Visual design consideration such as siting, color selection, and reclamation would be incorporated into all surface disturbing projects.

VRM Class I is assigned to all special areas where the current management situation requires a natural environment essentially unchanged by human actions, such as WSAs. All areas designated as ACECs to protect scenic resources would be managed as VRM Class I. Kilbourne Hole in Doña Ana County would be managed as VRM Class II.

2.4.3.8.3 *Visual Resources Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: VRM classes would be allocated as follows (see Map 2-6):

CLASS	ACRES
VRM Class I	38,521
VRM Class II	578,348
VRM Class III	840,655
VRM Class IV	1,375,138

The Sacramento Escarpment ACEC would be managed as VRM Class I to protect scenic resources.

The area 5 miles each side of the defined route of El Camino Real across the Jornada del Muerto Basin in Doña Ana and Sierra County would be managed as VRM Class II.

Alternative B: VRM classes would be allocated as follows (see Map 2-7):

CLASS	ACRES
VRM Class I	343,253
VRM Class II	893,669
VRM Class III	806,869
VRM Class IV	789,420

The following ACECs designated under this alternative would be managed as VRM Class I:

EXISTING ACECS

Sacramento Escarpment
Aden Lava Flow
Organ/Franklin Mountain
Robledo Mountains
Doña Ana Mountains

PROPOSED ACECS

Caballo Mountain
Broad Canyon
East Potrillo Mountains
Picacho Peak
Portions of Otero Mesa Grassland

Alternatives B, C, and D: Areas of high sensitivity would be managed as the priority for reducing visual contrast for VRM conformance through mitigation; examples include mineral material sites and abandoned mines, at the discretion of the authorized officer to mitigate new circumstances.

Five miles of either side of the El Camino Real National Historic Trail across the Jornada del Muerto Basin would be designated VRM Class II. Exceptions to this VRM designation would be considered following site-specific analysis where the proposed action is not visible from the trail, and the trail and its historic context are buffered by landscape features.

Based upon future inventory, study, and possible inclusion in the National Historic Trail System, VRM class designations may need to be amended for the following two historic trails: Butterfield Trail and Mormon Battalion Trail.

All WSAs would be managed as interim VRM Class I until such time as Congress designates them as wilderness or releases them from further study. Any areas released from wilderness study would be managed according to the adjacent VRM class for the area.

Alternative C: VRM classes in the *Decision Area* would be allocated as follows (see Map 2-8):

CLASS	ACRES
VRM Class I	271,406
VRM Class II	638,331
VRM Class III	809,935
VRM Class IV	1,113,396

The following ACECs designated under this alternative would be managed as VRM Class I:

EXISTING ACECS

Sacramento Escarpment
Robledo Mountains
Organ/Franklin Mountain
Doña Ana Mountains

PROPOSED ACECS

Nutt Mountain
Portions of Otero Mesa Grassland

Alternative D: VRM classes in the *Decision Area* would be allocated as follows (see Map 2-9):

CLASS	ACRES
VRM Class I	265,526
VRM Class II	689,513
VRM Class III	810,179
VRM Class IV	1,066,866

The following scenic ACECs would be managed as VRM Class I:

EXISTING ACECS

Sacramento Escarpment
Cornudas Mountain
Alamo Mountain
Wind Mountain
Organ/Franklin Mountain
Doña Ana Mountains
Robledo Mountains

PROPOSED ACECS

None

2.4.3.9 FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT

National fire management policy has evolved in response to the increased fatalities, property loss, local economic disruptions, and risk to ecosystems associated with increasingly catastrophic wildland fire seasons. The Fire and Fuels program for the BLM New Mexico as well as the Las Cruces District Office have adapted to meet these changes and are incorporated into the program for the TriCounty *Decision Area*.

Goals:

- Reduce the risk to human life and property from wildland fire.
- Reduce the risk and cost of fire suppression in areas of hazardous fuels buildup.
- Improve landscape health through returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem.

Objectives:

- Focus treatments on communities and surrounding areas with the potential for escaped fire or loss of life or property.
- Focus treatments on areas identified as containing hazardous fuels buildup, to reduce the risk and cost of fire suppression. Focus treatments on improving landscape health through treating lands in Fire Regime Condition Classes 2 and 3 to achieve the Desired Future Condition of Fire Regime Condition Class 1.
- Maintain Condition Class 1 where it occurs.

2.4.3.9.1 *Fire and Fuels Management Continuing Management Guidance*

The 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy directs Federal agencies to achieve a balance between fire suppression to protect life, property, and resources and wildfire management to regulate fuels and maintain healthy ecosystems. The policy provides nine guiding principles that are fundamental to the success of the Federal wildland fire management program:

1. Firefighter and public safety is the first priority in every fire management activity.
2. The role of wildland fire as an essential ecological process and natural change agent will be incorporated into the planning process.
3. Fire management plans, programs, and activities support land and resource management plans and their implementation.
4. Sound risk management is a foundation for all fire management activities.
5. Fire management programs and activities are economically viable, based upon values to be protected, costs, and land and resource management objectives.
6. Fire management plans and activities are based upon the best available science.
7. Fire management plans and activities incorporate public health and environmental quality considerations.
8. Federal, state, tribal, local, interagency, and international coordination and cooperation are essential.
9. Standardization of policies and procedures among Federal agencies is an ongoing objective.

2.4.3.9.2 *Fire and Fuels Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Fire management plans must be completed for all burnable acres in accordance with Federal fire policy. The fire management plans prescribe appropriate wildfire management response for all fire management units. The appropriate wildfire management response takes into account safety, cost, and resource management objectives.

In 2004, the BLM New Mexico State Office prepared the *Resource Management Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management on Public Land in New Mexico and Texas* (BLM 2004a) which amended all of the BLM New Mexico RMPs. The purpose of the amendment was to incorporate current fire management policy into RMPs, restore fire as an integral part of fire-adapted ecosystems to meet resource management objectives, improve the protection of human life and property through the reduction of hazardous fuels, and establish consistent methods of managing fire and fuels on public land in New Mexico and Texas.

Wildland fire management in the BLM's *Decision Area* would be guided by the Las Cruces District Office Fire Management Plan and includes specific language for managing fire and fuels within Fire Management Unit boundaries and tiers to the 2004 *Fire and Fuels RMP Amendment*. The current Fire Management Plan for Las Cruces District Office has been in place since 2004, and is updated annually. It guides all actions for fire and fuels management. The Fire Management Plan is not a NEPA document; therefore additional NEPA analysis is required for all fire treatments.

Fuels Treatments: Fuels treatments include various tools (i.e., prescribed fire, mechanical, biological, chemical) to reduce hazardous fuel loads, or to achieve resource objectives. Actual prescribed fire accomplishments vary greatly from year-to-year due to weather patterns. Actual mechanical treatment tends to be based on annual budget allocation. Treatment, via prescribed burning and mechanical treatments have averaged 4,672 acres per year for the past 8 years on the Las Cruces District.

Prescribed burning within the Las Cruces District Office area may occur anytime prescriptive parameters are met. Grassland burns take place before vegetation turns green. Piñon-juniper and most landscape broadcast burns take place during late spring and summer and require the warmest and driest parameters to meet objectives.

Fire Suppression: Residential developments that are surrounded by, or adjacent to, wildland in the *Planning Area* are termed wildland-urban interface areas. By definition wildland-urban interface areas include any area where vegetative fuels and human development meet and intermingle. These are high-priority full suppression areas due to public safety concerns.

The Fire and Fuels RMP Amendment states that under ideal conditions a total of approximately 73,000 acres District-wide could be treated annually. The District Office would have considerable flexibility in determining the appropriate treatments for specific areas. Effects on wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and other resources would be considered during treatment planning. The proportion of treatments would be balanced, with an average of 40 percent and a range of 20-45 percent of total acres treated with prescribed fire, 40 percent with a range of 20-40 percent with mechanical treatments, and 20 percent with chemical treatments. Biological treatments are not planned but may be considered for site-specific projects. The BLM would use a combination of any fuels management technique (wildfire for resource benefit, prescribed fire, mechanical treatment, chemical treatment, or biological treatment) on any fuel type, to meet fire and fuels management objectives.

2.4.3.9.3 *Fire and Fuels Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternatives A-D: The following decisions and prescriptions are taken from the *Resource Management Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management on Public Lands in New Mexico and Texas* (BLM 2004c) and are hereby incorporated into all alternatives of this RMP. These decisions would effectively guide the fire and fuels management program for the *Decision Area*; no other decisions are needed at this time. Impacts of these decisions have been analyzed; therefore, no other decisions are proposed.

Lands in the *Decision Area* would be assigned to one of the following Fire Management Categories:

Category A: Areas where fire is not desired at all.

Category B: Areas where unplanned wildfire is not desired because of current conditions.

Category C: Areas where fire is desired, but there are significant constraints on its use.

Category D: Areas where wildland fire is desired, and there are few or no constraints on its use.

Fire Management Units (FMUs) would be described, mapped and assigned to a Fire Management Category (See Table 3-6). FMUs would be changed as needed through the NEPA process to reflect dynamic effects of wildfire, prescribed fire, and non-fire treatments.

Fuels reduction treatments would be conducted with appropriate treatment for specific areas determined by local conditions.

Best management practices would be used in implementing fire suppression, managing wildfire for resource benefit, prescribed fires, and mechanical, chemical, and biological treatment methods (see Appendix D).

Wildfire management response would be based on the Las Cruces District Office Fire Management Plan, Fire and Fuels Plan Amendment and this RMP when responding to wildfire.

Areas such as buildings and structures, communication sites, important wildlife habitat, cultural or historical sites, developed recreation facilities and other areas would be identified for protection from wildland fire.

Vegetation treatments would be conducted using wildland fire for resource benefit, prescribed burns, mechanical treatments, and chemical treatments.

2.4.4 RESOURCE USES

2.4.4.1 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

The *Taylor Grazing Act* of 1934 is the legislative authority which provides for livestock grazing on public land. The FLPMA and the *Public Rangeland Improvement Act* further defines how livestock grazing is managed in the context of multiple-use and sustained yield. Livestock grazing occurs on 300 allotments in the *Decision Area* under a system of permits and leases in which ranchers pay grazing fees for the privilege of use. Most of the public land is open to grazing and is guided by the EIS for *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*. These guidelines provide the means for making adjustments in grazing as described below.

Goal:

- Manage livestock grazing on public land in a manner that ensures progress toward achieving the *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*.

Objectives:

- Complete or revise allotment management plans and functionally equivalent activity plans or decisions within priority watersheds and base them on allotment management status (Categories I, M, and C).
- Implement rangeland improvements within allotments or priority watersheds to optimize livestock management consistent with multiple-use objectives and designed for the maintenance and improvement of ecological conditions.
- Based on monitoring data, make appropriate changes in grazing management necessary to ensure progress toward attainment of *New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management* and other multiple-use objectives. Changes in grazing management would be consistent with the those guidelines and may include adjustments in permitted use levels, season of use, kind of livestock, allowable use levels, or stocking rates.
- Evaluate the feasibility of authorizing grazing on allotments against conflicts with site-specific issues and other resources. Close areas to grazing when necessary for the proper and efficient management of public rangelands.

2.4.4.1.1 *Livestock Grazing Continuing Management Guidance*

Grazing allotments or groups of allotments in a watershed would be reviewed based on the BLM's allotment categorization and watershed prioritization process (Appendix C). Management focus would be on high-priority watersheds; however, circumstances may arise that would require assessing standards and implementing and monitoring guidelines in other, lower-priority areas. Rangeland improvements would be implemented to improve or maintain watershed health and ensure progress towards or attainment of the *New Mexico Public Land Health Standards*. Rangeland improvements include, but are not limited to fences, pipelines, vegetation treatments, erosion control structures, storage tanks, water troughs, and cattle guards. Rangeland improvement priorities would be based on the following criteria:

1. Existence of an allotment management plan, functional equivalent activity plan, determination of *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* or other decisions;
2. Need to mitigate an emergency situation (e.g., fire, flooding, drought);
3. Need for public safety;
4. Amount of contributed funding;
5. Number of partnerships;
6. Direct/indirect benefit to special status species, critical fish and wildlife habitats, impaired waters, soil stabilization, or nonnative, invasive species;
7. Overall cost of the project in relation to the benefits.

Management according to the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines* would allow adjustments to use levels, season of use, kind of livestock, and stocking rates. In addition, the following management guidance would be used: (1) areas that are not meeting the standards of public land health due to livestock grazing would be identified and (2) guidelines would be implemented and monitored on areas that are not meeting or where progress is not being made toward attainment of the *New Mexico Standards and Guidelines*. Additional management actions that would be considered to ensure public land health

standard attainment could include, but not be limited to, implementing available forage reductions in shrub-dominated communities, implementing available forage reductions based on distance to water and implementing available forage reductions based on percent slope (see Appendix B).

Under the 1986 and 1993 RMPs, the accepted maximum forage use levels ranged from 40 to 60 percent. However, researchers on stocking rate studies in the Southwest (including Jornada Experimental Range near Las Cruces) recommended that desert ranges be routinely stocked for around 30-35 percent use of average forage production with some reduction in stocking in drought years (Holechek, et al. 1999).

2.4.4.1.2 *Livestock Grazing Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Livestock grazing would continue to be managed consistent with Federal law, BLM policy, guidance and regulation using any and/or all management tools available. These authorities, policy and guidance provide for implementing management actions such as using livestock grazing as a tool to control invasive species, reduce fire danger, and accomplish other management objectives.

Grazing permits and leases would continue to be issued and/or renewed according to BLM policy, guidance, and the grazing regulations. Grazing permits are authorized for a period of 10 years. As permits expire, permit renewals would be considered and issued under all alternatives. All permit renewals would be analyzed through the appropriate NEPA document.

Alternatives would be considered in these documents including but not limited to renewing the permit with existing terms and conditions or changing the terms and conditions to meet the standards for public land health or grazing policy changes.

No grazing of domestic sheep or goats would be authorized within currently occupied bighorn sheep habitats, identified migration corridors, and buffer strips no less than 9 miles (except where topographic features or other barriers exist), or as developed through a cooperative agreement to minimize contact between native wild sheep and domestic sheep and goats consistent with existing BLM policy guidance. Where the BLM has authorized changes in kind of livestock grazing from domestic sheep or goats to cattle within potentially suitable bighorn sheep habitat, such permits would not be converted back to sheep or goats unless it has been determined that the presence of exotic wildlife species managed by the NMDGF would still preclude successful management of native wild sheep populations.

Grassland restoration treatments would be rested for a minimum of two growing seasons (June 1 to October 31) following treatment. The need for adjusting pre- and post-treatment growing season rest would be determined on a site-specific basis. An appropriate utilization level would be established for the other pastures or portions of pastures during the growing season deferment of the treatments to ensure attainment of the overall objectives for the allotment.

Supplements in the form of salt, mineral, and protein would be located a minimum of ¼-mile from existing livestock waters and riparian areas. No maintenance feeding would be allowed on public land.

The Las Cruces District Office manages 20 allotments wholly or partially outside the *Planning Area*. These are shown in Appendix E. Management of livestock grazing within these allotments would continue under this RMP unless they are transferred to another office. Such a transfer and subsequent management could be executed by a management agreement between the Las Cruces District Office and the receiving office. No further planning or NEPA documentation would be required.

2.4.4.1.3 *Livestock Grazing Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Grazing treatments would be incorporated into activity plans for Category I and selected Category M allotments to meet management objectives and goals established for each individual allotment. Monitoring studies would be established on all Category I allotments with those in priority watersheds being first.

The following areas would continue to be closed to grazing:

SITES CLOSED TO GRAZING	ACRES
Percha Creek	870
Tularosa Creek	236
Dripping Springs Natural Area	530
Aguirre Spring Campground	23
Three Rivers Petroglyph Campground	340
Wildlife waters and other habitat improvements	50
TOTAL	2,049

Alternative B Vegetation communities on areas needing restoration would be treated using passive methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Any vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved for watershed function and wildlife.

Allotments or portions of allotments that may end up as non-permitted in the future or result in unmanageable conflicts with other uses would be closed.

Livestock grazing would be allowed in all parts of the *Decision Area* except for the areas closed to grazing in Alternative A, unallotted areas (areas that currently are not within an allotment but have not been officially closed to livestock grazing) and areas with unmanageable conflicts (at least 10,295 acres with additional areas added as appropriate over time), and non-permitted allotments, allotments currently without an authorization (permit or lease) to graze livestock, (5,258 acres).

Grazing preference of forage allocated to livestock on the 950,000 acres of limited restoration potential would be reduced by 25 percent. The reduced animal unit months (AUMs) would be placed into suspension and a portion, or all, may be reactivated following determinations of significant progress toward meeting restoration objectives.

Alternative C: Vegetation communities and areas needing restoration would be treated using a combination of passive and active methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Vegetation increases as a result of grassland restoration treatments would be reserved to meet the needs of watershed function. Vegetation in excess of those needs would be allocated to wildlife and livestock, with wildlife receiving priority over livestock. However, there would be no increase in licensed AUMs as a result of vegetation increases.

Allotments or portions of allotments that may end up as non-permitted in the future or result in unmanageable conflicts with other uses would be closed to grazing after health standard assessment, determination, and decision to allocate to other uses.

Livestock grazing would be allowed in all parts of the *Decision Area* except for the areas closed to grazing in Alternative A, unallotted areas and areas with unmanageable conflicts that have been evaluated

using the health standard assessment and determination (at least 10,295 acres with additional areas added as appropriate over time), and non-permitted allotments (5,258 acres).

Grazing use adjustments would be based on watershed priorities, allotment and ecological site health standard assessments, and monitoring.

Isolated parcels of Federal land within Section 15 lease allotments would be disposed of in order to eliminate those allotments.

Alternative D: Vegetation communities and areas needing restoration would be treated using active methods to meet the ecological site's potential natural community or capability. Vegetation in excess of those needs would be allocated to wildlife and livestock with neither having priority over the other. In any case there would be no increase in grazing preference as a result of vegetation increases.

The following areas would be closed to grazing, however, grazing would be allowed as a management tool:

SITES CLOSED TO GRAZING	ACRES
Percha Creek	870
Tularosa Creek	236
Wildlife waters and other habitat improvements	50
TOTAL ACRES	1,156

2.4.4.1.4 *Summary of Grazing Decisions by Alternative*

Alternative A- 2,049 acres closed to grazing. Livestock adjustments done on a case-by case-basis, based on monitoring.

Alternative B- 17,602 acres closed to grazing as well as allotments with unmanageable conflicts. Twenty-five percent reductions in livestock grazing on vegetation with limited restoration potential.

Alternative C- 17,602 acres closed to grazing as well as allotments with unmanageable conflicts after evaluation and determination. Livestock adjustments made on a watershed priority basis based on monitoring.

Alternative D- 1,156 acres closed to grazing. Livestock adjustments done on a case-by-case basis, based on monitoring.

2.4.4.2 COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

This section contains proposed decisions for travel and vehicle use throughout the *Decision Area*. While these decisions pertain to all uses and all vehicles, policy dictates that BLM prescribe and define OHV use specifically. Areas for vehicle use must be delineated, and the type of use allowed must be defined; all parts of the *Decision Area* must be prescribed as Open, Closed, or Limited for OHV use.

An Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) is defined by 43 CFR Section 8340.0-5 as any motorized vehicle capable of or designed for travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding (1) any non-amphibious registered motorboat; (2) any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes; (3) any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the authorized officer, or otherwise officially approved or permitted; (4) vehicles in official use by administering agencies such as the BLM or other agency; and (5) any combat or combat support vehicle

when used in times of national defense emergencies. Law enforcement, emergency vehicles and administrative vehicle use is excepted in this definition and the decisions contained here do not apply to those activities and uses.

Goal:

- Develop a trails and travel network that balances public access to and across public land with the enjoyment, use, and protection of sensitive natural, cultural, and historic resources.

Objectives:

- Through the RMP and through travel management planning following RMP approval, designate areas and routes within the *Decision Area* as being Closed, Limited in Use, or Open.
- Acquire, maintain, and enhance access to and across public land where needed to improve management efficiency and to facilitate multiple uses and the public's enjoyment of the land in coordination with other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and private landowners.

2.4.4.2.1 *Trails and Travel Continuing Management Guidance*

All public land is required to be allocated for different levels of OHV use (43 CFR Section 8342.1). Areas must be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel activities. A defined travel management network should be completed during the development of the land use plan to the extent practical. Within the *TriCounty Planning Area*, a definitive route inventory and route designation could not be completed during this planning effort except for ACECs. Until the final travel management network is established, motorized travel would be Limited to Existing Routes at the time of the approval of the land use plan, unless specifically identified otherwise within the *TriCounty RMP/EIS*. As travel management plans are completed, formal route designations would automatically result in changing the OHV Area designations from "limited to *existing* roads, primitive roads, and trails" to "limited to *designated* roads, primitive roads, and trails."

Appendix O provides further explanation of BLM's OHV definitions and associated terms, route designation and closure criteria, and the WSA and ACEC route inventories. Motorized or mechanized vehicle travel in WSAs is limited to only those ways which existed at the time the area became a WSA. Future travel designations may be made for a WSA if released from study.

Cross-country use is permitted in areas designated as open for such travel; however, undue and unnecessary degradation of resources is not permitted on any area of public land under regulations found in 43 CFR Section 8340. Exceptions may be made to OHV designations to accommodate emergency or permitted or authorized uses as allowed by the regulations at 43 CFR Section 8340.

Existing routes as used in this section are defined as follows:

- For WSAs, existing routes are those routes which existed at the time the area was designated a WSA. For the Organ Needles and Peña Blanca WSAs, that date is December 1993. For all other WSAs addressed in this document that date is November 1980.
- For the rest of the *Decision Area*, existing routes are those routes which exist at the time the ROD are signed for this RMP.

2.4.4.2.2 *Trails and Travel Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Travel and transportation networks would be targeted for completion for the entire *Decision Area* within 5 years of the ROD for this RMP/EIS. In Alternatives B, C, and D, areas would be identified for which to prepare travel management plans. Priorities would be determined based on a number of factors including need for resource protection, need for public and administrative access, public interest, and other management considerations. The designation of travel management areas, the preparation of travel management plans for these areas, the priority criteria, and timeframes for travel management plan development after approval of the TriCounty ROD are described in Appendix O

Where off-road vehicles are causing or would cause considerable adverse effects upon soil, vegetation, fish and wildlife, fish and wildlife habitats, cultural resources, historical resources, threatened or endangered species, wilderness suitability, other authorized uses, or other resources, the affected areas shall be immediately closed to the type(s) of vehicle causing the adverse effect until the adverse effects are eliminated and measures implemented to prevent recurrence. This would be accomplished through the use of emergency closures as provided in Supplementary Rules at 43 CFR 8365.1-6.

Under all alternatives, the following processes and procedures would be implemented in support of the transportation program:

- Acquire easements if new road construction crosses state trust or private lands.
- Conduct road maintenance and easement acquisition in support of resource management objectives, subject to available funds.
- Consider new road construction in areas where travel is restricted due to topography or terrain based upon a number of planning criteria including, but not limited to, recreation demand, the ability to protect resources, promoting public safety, and minimizing user conflicts.
- Support access actions with cadastral survey and appraisals.

In the Organ Mountains, non-motorized closures of public land would be accomplished in compliance with Supplementary Rules (43CFR 8365, 1-6). The following trails shown on Maps J-8 and J-9 would be limited to designated use as indicated:

- Sierra Vista Trail - Hiking, equestrian and mountain biking
- Pine Tree Trail - Hiking
- Baylor Pass Trail - Hiking and equestrian
- Dripping Springs Trails (multiple trails) - Hiking
- Bar Canyon Trail - Hiking, equestrian and mountain biking

2.4.4.2.3 *Trails and Travel Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: A total of 1,635,700 acres in the *Decision Area* would be designated as Open to OHV use (Table 2-8) Most of the open area, 99.5 percent, is in Sierra and Otero Counties. Cross-country travel would be allowed in these areas.

The following areas in Doña Ana County would be Closed to motor vehicle use:

- The Mexican border area south of Anapra-Columbus Road and south of State Route 9. Vehicle use for law enforcement and administrative purpose would be allowed.
- Portions of the Organ/Franklin Mountains
- Los Tules ACEC.

TABLE 2-8 VEHICLE USE DESIGNATIONS BY ALTERNATIVE				
DESIGNATION	ACRES			
	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Open	1,635,700	38,966	41,908	41,909
Limited to Existing Routes	878,636	2,003,192	2,202,425	2,496,266
Limited to Designated Routes	272,021	523,000	569,724	277,336
Closed	42,953	267,630	20,000	17,485

Any road or trail created by the passage of vehicles after December 1993 would not be considered Open and would be subject to closure.

In Sierra and Otero Counties, the BLM would attempt to acquire legal access to most of the public land that does not currently have public access by acquiring easements for 36 miles of existing non-Federal roads and constructing 238 miles of new roads. Easements would be acquired for new road construction crossing State trust or private lands.

In Doña Ana County, the BLM would develop access in the following four areas through new road construction around non-Federal lands, land ownership adjustments, or easement acquisition. Suitable access may be either vehicular or pedestrian depending on the situation.

- Organ Mountains: Acquire legal public access for vehicular use south of Soledad Canyon through private properties.
- Robledo Mountains: Acquire legal public access across private land for vehicular use on the north end. Acquire legal public access from Shalem Colony Road to the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument.
- West Potrillo Mountains: Acquire legal public access to the north and west sides.

In the Aden Hills OHV Area in Doña Ana County, 8,055 acres would be designated as Open for motor and mechanical vehicle use.

Alternatives B, C, and D: Vehicle use designations by area would be as shown in Table 2-8 and Maps 2-11, 2-12, and 2-13. Under the three action alternatives, five travel management areas would be designated and a travel management plan, including access needs, would be prepared for each area following completion of the *TriCounty RMP*:

- Doña Ana County
- Otero Mesa/Crow Flats
- Otero County west of McGregor Range and the Lincoln National Forest
- Jornada del Muerto and Caballo Mountains
- Sierra County west of the Rio Grande

The five areas encompass the entire *Planning Area*. The order in which travel management planning would be done for these areas would depend on funding priorities and resources available to do the planning, amount of route inventory completed for each area, and other factors.

The Red Sands OHV Area (33,854 acres) and the Aden Hills OHV Area (8,055 acres) would be designated as Open to vehicle use. Cross-country travel would be allowed in the open area. However, competitive and commercial events would be limited to designated routes.

Alternative B: The following areas would be Closed to motor vehicle use (Table 2-8 and Map 2-11):

AREA	ACRES
All WSAs	261,793
Bar Canyon	423
Peña Blanca South	260
Peña Blanca North	120
Jarilla Mountains ACEC	700
Los Tules ACEC	23
Percha Creek ACEC	870
Sacramento Mountains ACEC\	2,381
Six Shooter Canyon ACEC	1,060
TOTAL	267,630

These closures include mechanical vehicle use in WSAs. Closed routes are shown on maps in Appendix O. Vehicle use in the remaining ACECs would be Limited to Designated routes upon completion of the five travel management plans described above in Alternatives B, C, and D. All existing vehicle ways within WSAs would be closed. Existing cherry stems, which are routes (roads or spurs into a WSA that are unprotected because the WSA boundary has been drawn around the road) would remain open to vehicle use unless such use would cause damage to wilderness values. If so, cherry stems would be closed under Supplementary Rules at 43 CFR 8365. 1-6.

Vehicle use on 770,000 acres including the International border area south of State Route 9 would be Limited to Existing Routes until a route inventory and travel management plan are completed.

Under Alternative B, the BLM would not seek to obtain legal public access to public land anywhere in the *Decision Area*.

Alternative C: The Organ Needles and Peña Blanca WSAs, Bar Canyon, and the Sacramento Mountains and Percha Creek ACECs , a total of 20,000 acres, would be Closed to motor and mechanical vehicle use.

Vehicle use on 2,202,425 acres would be Limited to Existing Routes until a route inventory and travel management plans are completed.

Vehicle routes adversely affecting riparian areas and arroyos would be closed or rerouted. Where legal vehicle access is not available across non-Federal land to public land beyond, BLM would consider developing access based on public input and resource management needs including recreation, cultural, minerals and biological resources. Means to acquire access would include new road construction on public land to bypass the non-Federal land, land ownership adjustments, or acquisition of easements across the non-Federal land. Easement acquisition (through purchase, exchange or donation) would be anticipated to be the predominant method of obtaining legal access.

The focus of acquisition would be on connecting those routes designated as Open for motorized vehicle use under travel management plans. A more complete picture of access needs in the *Planning Area* would be developed in the travel management plans.

Alternatives C and D: Motor vehicle and mechanical vehicle use in the WSAs would be limited to routes that existed at the time the areas were designated WSAs. Motor and mechanical vehicle use in ACECs would be Limited To Designated Routes upon completion of travel management plans for the ACECs.

Legal access would be sought across non-Federal land to the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument in the Rocky Trails area (private land), in the southeast corner (State trust land), and on the northwest boundary (State trust land). Access would be for both public and administrative purposes.

Alternative D: Vehicle use would be Limited To Existing Routes on 2,496,266 acres until a route inventory and travel management plans are completed.

Vehicle use on 85,978 acres in existing ACECs and 193,573 acres in SRMAs would be Limited to Designated Routes.

Where legal vehicle access is needed across non-Federal land to public land beyond, access would be developed through new road construction around non-Federal land, through land ownership adjustments, or through easement acquisition. All available methods would be used to obtain legal public or administrative access from willing landowners to cross non-Federal land to reach public land lacking adequate access (e.g., easements acquired through purchase, exchange, or donation).

The focus of acquisition would be connecting those routes designated as open for motorized vehicle use. A more complete picture of access needs in the *Planning Area* would be developed in the various travel management plans.

2.4.4.3 RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES

Outdoor recreation is a major activity on the public land in the *Decision Area*. Recreation occurs at BLM developed sites such as campgrounds, picnic areas, and historical sites; as well as in dispersed areas. Popular dispersed activities include hunting, sightseeing, wildlife watching, rock hounding, off-highway driving, camping, and geocaching. Maintaining these areas to meet the recreational experiences desired by the many users is a major management issue for the Las Cruces District Office.

Goals:

- Developed outdoor recreation opportunities that offer a range of benefits, activities, and experiences in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs).
- Recreation opportunities that facilitate visitor's freedom to pursue a variety of outdoor recreation activities and attain a variety of outcomes in Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs).

Objectives:

- Provide the public with appropriate information to plan, prepare, and choose safe, enjoyable, and appropriate recreational uses of public land.
- Provide and maintain legal access to public land in SRMAs and ERMAs.
- Increase understanding, tolerance, and respect for other recreation user types. Improve recreation participant's awareness and sense of stewardship for natural and cultural resource values.

2.4.4.3.1 *Recreation and Visitor Services Continuing Management Guidance*

Most recreation use management is considered administrative and consists of recreational services and use-supervision actions such as installing signs, issuing permits for group events, reducing conflict among user groups, and patrolling and enforcing recreation use regulations. BLM's rules of conduct establish a fundamental framework for the management of all recreation uses on public land (43 CFR Section 8365). The emphasis of these rules of conduct is on the protection of public land and its resources and for the

protection, comfort, and well-being of the public. Beyond this, recreation management in the *Planning Area* is influenced by public demand, policy for certain types of recreation (e.g., hunting, OHV use,) and consistency with the existing management decisions.

The BLM's general recreation management policy is described in *BLM Manual Sections 8300 and 8320*. General objectives of the BLM's recreation management program are to (1) provide a broad spectrum of recreation resources dependent on recreation opportunities, to meet the needs and demands of visitors to public land; (2) foster agency-wide efforts to improve service to the visiting public; (3) maintain high-quality recreation facilities to meet public needs and enhance the image of the agency; and (4) improve public understanding and support of the BLM by effectively communicating the BLM's multiple-use management programs to the recreation visitor.

RMP decisions for recreation and visitor services include the designation of recreation management areas, establishing management objectives for those areas and describing allowable uses for these areas. The existing and proposed SRMAs and ERMAs are described in Appendix F. These descriptions include management objectives, characteristics, primary activities, and experiences available in the areas.

SRMAs are administrative units where the existing or proposed recreation opportunities and recreation setting characteristics are recognized for their unique value, importance, or distinctiveness; especially compared to other areas used for recreation. The SRMAs are managed to protect and enhance a targeted set of activities, experiences, benefits, and desired recreation setting characteristics. These areas usually represent a greater investment both in funding and management than do the ERMAs. ERMAs are administrative units that require specific management consideration in order to address recreation use, demand, or Recreation and Visitor Services program investments. ERMAs are managed to support and sustain the principal recreation activities and the associated qualities and conditions of the ERMA. ERMA management is commensurate and considered in context with the management of other resources and resource uses.

One of the major attractions of BLM land for the recreating public is the remoteness and open spaces that the National System of Public Land offers. Minor new facilities in ERMAs (e.g., toilets, kiosks, directional signs, fire pits, etc.) would be considered to protect or enhance important resources. Construction of additional recreation trails would be considered based on need. Public lands that are not designated as "*Special*" or "*Extensive*" RMAs would be managed for basic recreation and resource stewardship needs where recreation would not be emphasized; however recreation activities would occur except on those lands closed to public use. Recreation would be managed to allow recreation uses that are not in conflict with the primary uses of these lands. Those lands not designated SRMAs or ERMAs would provide the recreation opportunities and experiences of the wide-open and undeveloped spaces of the public land.

2.4.4.3.2 *Recreation and Visitor Services Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Any signs would be designed and constructed of materials that would be unobtrusive and blend with surrounding landscape settings, consistent with VRM class objectives for the area. Signing generally would be the minimum necessary to provide for safety and information or to control unauthorized use.

The Las Cruces District Office staff would seek opportunities or partnerships with other agencies, educational institutions, volunteers, and other organizations to enrich interpretation and environmental education opportunities. The BLM would work in collaboration to distribute accurate information on recreational opportunities, land ethics, regulations, safety, education, and maps and travel opportunities.

Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would be issued where there is a need to control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, provide visitor health and safety, and provide a fair return to the United States for the commercial recreational use. Unless prohibited by other RMP decisions, SRPs would be authorized throughout the *Planning Area* on a discretionary basis. The decision to grant or deny an SRP application would be based on a number of factors that include but are not limited to: conformance with laws and land use plans, protection of resources, public safety, and conflicts with other uses (43 CFR 2930). Geocaching, letterboxing sites, and paintball activities would be prohibited in archaeological sites, paleontological areas, caves, designated wilderness, WSAs, and National Natural Landmarks. The BLM will enforce the prohibition of these activities using Supplemental Rules under 43 CFR 8365.1-6.

Las Cruces District Office Supplemental Rules (*Federal Register*, Volume 60, No. 218, page 57014, FR document 95-27596) prohibits the discharge of firearms within ½-mile of developed recreation sites and areas, which includes the following areas:

- Dripping Springs Natural Area with ½-mile buffer (approximately 5,160 acres)
- Aguirre Spring Campground with ½-mile buffer (approximately 2,325 acres)
- Three Rivers Petroglyph Site with ½-mile buffer (approximately 1,850 acres)
- Lake Valley Historic Site with ½-mile buffer (approximately 190 acres)
- Paleozoic Trackways RNA T. 22 S., R. 1 E., Section 19 (approximately 100 acres)

Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark is closed to discharge of firearms below the rim of the crater (approximately 815 acres). See Appendix N for further descriptions of these sites.

2.4.4.3.3 *Recreation and Visitor Services Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Continue management of 61,000 acres as the Organ Mountains SRMA and manage according to the Organ Mountains Coordinated Resource Management Plan. Two SRMAs would be allocated and managed as follows; Organ/Franklin Mountains SRMA (60,807 acres) and Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (8,344 acres).

Hunting and target shooting would be allowed within the Doña Ana Mountains SRMA. Public land outside of Prehistoric Trackways National Monument, approximately 100 acres, in T. 22 S., R. 1 E., Section 19, would be closed to the discharge of firearms. (See Map2-42,)

Alternatives B, C, and D: Recreation management areas would be allocated and managed as SRMAs and ERMAs under Alternatives B, C, and D as shown in Table 2-9.

Community Pit #1, located in Doña Ana County off of Shalem Colony Road (T. 22 S., R. 1 E., Section 19, S½SE¼), would be closed to public access due to unsafe conditions in the gravel mine. Public access would be allowed after the area was successfully reclaimed and safety conditions improved.

Alternative B: The following developed recreation areas and sites (described in Appendix N and shown on Map 2-43) would be closed to the discharge of firearms, including hunting and dispersed recreational target shooting. The total closed acreage includes a ½-mile buffer:

- Permian Tracks Road (290 acres)
- Developed Recreation Trails in the Organ/Franklin Mountains SRMA (20,015 acres)
- All public land within the Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (7,600 acres)
- Tortugas Mountain RMZ (970 acres)
- Dog Canyon Road, Otero County (200 acres)
- Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (200 acres)
- Picacho Peak RMZ (5,350 acres)

Alternative C: The following developed recreation areas and sites (described in Appendix N and shown on Map 2-44) would be closed to the discharge of firearms, including hunting and recreational target shooting. The total closed acreage includes a ½-mile buffer.

- Permian Tracks Road (290 acres)
- Developed Recreation Trails in the Organ/Franklin Mountains SRMA (20,015 acres)
- Public land in the southern portion of the Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (3,145 acres)
- Tortugas Mountain RMZ (970 acres)
- Dog Canyon Road, Otero County (200 acres)
- Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (200 acres)
- Picacho Peak RMZ (5,350 acres)

Alternative D: The following developed recreation areas and sites (described in Appendix N and shown on Map 2-45) would be closed to the discharge of firearms, including hunting and recreational target shooting. The total closed acreage includes a ½-mile buffer.

- Permian Tracks Road (290 acres)
- Developed Recreation Trails in the Organ/Franklin Mountains SRMA (20,015 acres)
- Hunting would be allowed throughout the Doña Ana Mountains SRMA but dispersed recreational target shooting would be prohibited (7,600 acres).
- Tortugas Mountain RMZ (970 acres)
- Dog Canyon Road, Otero County (200 acres)
- Doña Ana Mountains SRMA (200 acres)
- Picacho Peak RMZ (5,350 acres)
- Tularosa Creek SRMA (585 acres)

TABLE 2-9
RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT BY ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Las Cruces SRMA: Designate 80,960 acres as the Las Cruces SRMA containing four recreation management zones (RMZs) and manage as follows:</p> <p><u>Organ/Franklin Mountains RMZ</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing and mineral material disposal. • Manage as VRM Class I above 5,000 feet and Classes III and IV for remainder of area. • Retain all public land within boundary. Acquire State trust, private inholdings, and edge holdings from willing sellers. • Maintain current livestock grazing use. <p><u>Doña Ana Mountains RMZ</u></p> <p>Manage the portion of the SRMA inside the ACEC as described in Table 2-17 under Doña Ana Mountains ACEC. Manage the remaining area as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close area to sale of mineral material and recommend for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Apply NSO stipulation to fluid-mineral leases. • Manage as VRM Classes III and IV outside of ACEC. <p><u>Tortugas Mountain RMZ</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing and sale of mineral material. • Recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Manage as VRM Classes III and IV. • Close to discharge of firearms. <p><u>Picacho Peak RMZ</u></p> <p>Manage the portion of the SRMA within the ACEC as prescribed in Table 2-17 under Picacho Peak ACEC. Manage the rest of the area as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Apply a NSO stipulation to fluid-mineral leases. • Close to discharge of firearms. • Manage as VRM Class I. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <p>Anthony Gap utility corridor in the Organ/Franklin Mountains would be up to 2 miles wide.</p>	<p>Same as in Alternative C except:</p> <p>Identify 645 acres as the Talavera ERMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes • Close to mineral material disposal • Open to geothermal leasing with NSO stipulation. • Manage as VRM Class IV • Eliminate livestock grazing if irresolvable conflicts with other uses arise.

TABLE 2-9
RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT BY ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Identify and manage 5,100 acres as the Aden Hills OHV ERMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as an open OHV use area. Limit permitted events and activities to designated routes. • Retain public land. • Close to sale of mineral material. • Apply an NSO stipulation to fluid-mineral leasing. • Recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Continue livestock grazing but consider closing to grazing if conflicts arise. • Manage as VRM Class III. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except identify 8,052 acres as the Aden Hills OHV ERMA.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>Designate 1,000 acres as the Lake Valley SRMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Limit trail use to pedestrian traffic. • Close to mineral material disposal, allow fluid-mineral leasing with NSO, and recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Avoid new rights-of-way unless they benefit management of the historic resources or SRMA. • Manage as VRM Class III 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>Designate 1,043 acres as the Three Rivers Petroglyph SRMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Limit trail use to pedestrian traffic. • Maintain grazing closure. • Maintain mineral withdrawal. • Close to fluid-mineral leasing and mineral material disposal. • Close to discharge of firearms. • Exclude new rights-of-way. • Retain public land. • Acquire non-Federal land within SRMA boundary from willing sellers. • Manage as VRM Class II. 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

TABLE 2-9
RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT BY ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Identify 33,854 acres as the Red Sands OHV ERMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as an open OHV area. Limit permitted activities and events to designated routes. • Continue grazing use. Monitor for conflicts. Should conflicts between grazing and motorized use arise, consider closing to grazing. • Open to fluid-mineral leasing with a controlled surface use constraint. • Retain public land. Acquire state trust land from willing owner. • Manage as VRM Class IV 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>No Decision</p>	<p>Identify 26,501 acres as the Elephant Butte ERMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Allow geothermal leasing with a controlled surface use stipulation. • Manage as VRM Classes III and IV. • Continue livestock grazing. • Avoid new rights-of-way 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>No Decision</p>	<p>No Decision</p>	<p>Identify 41,288 acres as the Caballo Mountain ERMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. • Avoid new ROWs. • Allow geothermal leasing with standard terms and conditions. • Manage as VRM Classes II and III. • Maintain livestock grazing.

TABLE 2-9
RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT BY ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>No Decision</p>	<p>No Decision</p>	<p>Designate 230 acres as the Tularosa Creek SRMA and manage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit vehicle use to designated routes. Limit trail use to pedestrians. • Close to mineral leasing and mineral material disposal. • Close to discharge of firearms. • Recommend withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Retain public land. • Manage as VRM Class IV
<p>Manage the remainder of the <i>Decision Area</i> for dispersed recreation activities. No special emphasis would be placed on recreation management, however, management actions and allowable use decisions may still be necessary to address basic recreation and visitor services and resource stewardship needs such as visitor health and safety.</p> <p>Use and user conflict; the type(s), activities and locations where special recreation permits would be issued or not issued; mitigation of recreation impacts on cultural and natural resources.</p>	<p>Same as in Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as in Alternative B.</p>

2.4.4.4 LANDS AND REALTY

The lands and realty program has the primary responsibility for managing public land for land use, purchase, exchange, donation and sale, and determining the boundaries of Federal land.

Goal:

- Within the context of multiple-use management, conduct a land tenure program and land use authorizations to accomplish resource management goals and to meet public interest, community, local, state, and Federal agency, and ecological needs.

Objectives:

- Provide opportunity for use of public land for commercial or non-commercial use through issuance of a right-of-way, lease or permit.
- Provide access to public land.
- Utilize withdrawal actions with the least restrictive measures and minimum size necessary to accomplish the required purposes.
- Resolve in a prompt, efficient manner realty-related unauthorized use, occupancy or development.
- Make public land or interests in land available for community growth and expansion needs, recreation and public purpose use, and infrastructure needs. Meet the needs of other Federal agencies, certain state and local governmental agencies and other qualified organizations.

2.4.4.4.1 *Lands and Realty Continuing Management Guidance*

Land Tenure Adjustments: Under the Recreation & Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, land would be leased and later patented for public uses such as parks, schools sites, public buildings, and other uses for community improvement. Patents would be issued for existing landfills and managed shooting ranges (see Appendix M); however, no portions of these R&PP patented lands would revert to the United States if such portion was used for solid waste or hazardous substance disposal. In accordance with current policy, new land use authorizations would not be issued for uses which would involve the disposal or storage of materials which could contaminate the land (hazardous waste, landfills, rifle ranges, etc.).

Although this RMP/EIS identifies public land as being suitable for disposal or withdrawal such land may not actually be disposed. Land disposal by the BLM is a discretionary action. Each proposed disposal would be evaluated through the NEPA process and analyzed on its own merits at the time of such proposal. If any agency is interested in acquiring or managing any land identified for disposal, it is incumbent upon that agency to let the BLM know and initiate the withdrawal or transfer process. The BLM would contact adjacent landowners, government entities, and interested parties to fully coordinate the proposal to determine any impacts the proposed action may have on management of adjacent lands.

Land, or interests in land identified for disposal, would be subject to valid existing rights. Existing FLPMA and Mineral Leasing Act right-of-way grant holders would be provided an opportunity to negotiate new grant terms and conditions.

The BLM may dispose of land or interests in land under the Desert Land Entries Act, the Carey Act or Indian Allotment Act; however, because no land in the *Decision Area* has been identified as meeting the criteria under these authorities, none are available for such disposal.

Newly acquired land would be managed in the same manner as comparable surrounding public land or in conformance with established guidelines until the land use plan is updated. Land acquired within or adjacent to WSAs would be inventoried for wilderness characteristics. If present, wilderness characteristics in the area would be managed to protect those characteristics until a management decision for the area is made in the next land-use planning cycle. Land acquired within or adjacent to ACECs would be evaluated to determine if it contains resources that meet the relevance and importance criteria of the ACEC. If so, the acquired parcel would be managed to protect those values until a decision could be made to include the acquired parcel as part of the ACEC.

Acquired land may not be leased or conveyed under the R&PP Act. Bankhead-Jones land is not “*public land*” as the term is used in the R&PP Act and therefore, is not subject to lease or sale under this Act; and it is not public land as that term is used in the state indemnity selection laws and therefore, it may not be conveyed to a state under those laws. The land may be conveyed through FLPMA exchange or sale, or use authorized under that Act. Land and interests in land obtained with Land and Water Conservation Fund appropriations would not be available for disposal by any means.

Disposals and Acquisitions: Only land in identified areas would be available for potential disposal. Disposal of land outside of identified areas to resolve unauthorized use of public land would be considered only when there are no other practical means of resolution. Lands in retention areas may be disposed of through R&PP lease or sale if there are no conflicts with other resources. Sections 203 and 209 of FLPMA state that sales are the preferred method of disposal.

The BLM would consider disposing of or acquiring land, or interest in land, in accordance with resource management objectives, RMP decisions, disposal and acquisition authorities, detailed in Appendix M.

In addition to FLPMA, the lands and realty program is guided by a number of laws, regulations and policies dealing with land sales, exchanges, grants, withdrawals and other actions in the program. Many of these laws and guidance are shown in Appendix A.

Access: Owners of non-Federal land surrounded by public land would be allowed a degree of access across public land which would provide for the reasonable use and enjoyment of the non-Federal land.

Where access to public land is blocked by private or State trust land, the BLM would develop access through new road construction around non-Federal lands, land ownership adjustments, or easement acquisition. Suitable access may be either vehicular or pedestrian depending on the situation.

Rights-of-Way: Title V of FLPMA provides the BLM authority to grant rights-of-way (ROWs) to any qualified individual, business, or government entity for a variety of industrial and commercial needs. These ROWs may be site locations including renewable energy generation or communication site facilities or linear facilities including transmission lines, highways, railroads, or pipelines. Avoidance areas are to be avoided but may be available for ROWs with special stipulations. Excluded areas are those where ROWs would not be allowed unless required by law.

Under the authority of FLPMA and the Mineral Leasing Act, the Las Cruces District Office would continue to grant ROWs, leases, permits, and easements to qualified individuals, businesses, and government entities for use of public land in the BLM’s *Decision Area*. ROW grants would include authorizations for access, utility and telephone lines, fiber-optic lines, and communication sites. New ROW facilities would be located within or adjacent to existing ROWs, to the extent practical, in order to minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate ROWs. In particular, new communication site users would be grouped into suitable existing sites to reduce impacts and expedite application processing.

The BLM 2008 ROD for the *Westwide Energy Corridor Final Programmatic EIS* was intended to accommodate growth, improve reliability, relieve congestion, and otherwise enhance grids for oil, gas, and electricity transmission and distribution, and to accommodate hydrogen. Designated corridors determined in the ROD have been incorporated into this RMP.

Realty-related unauthorized use would be abated through prevention, detection, and resolution of such uses. Upon settlement of trespass liabilities, resolution of unauthorized use or development would be accomplished through termination, authorization, or sale or exchange, as appropriate. BLM land affected by unauthorized uses or development would be rehabilitated as determined necessary. Trespass resolution would be conducted in accordance with regulations located in 43 CFR 2808, 2920 and 9230.

Any use determined to be outside the definition of casual use would only be authorized as provided by Section 302 of FLPMA.

Land Use - Lease, Permits, and Easements: FLPMA also provides the BLM authority to issue leases, permits, and easements for the use, occupancy, and development of the public land. Leases and permits are issued for a variety of purposes such as commercial filming, advertising displays, temporary or permanent facilities for commercial purposes (does not include mining claims), and water pipelines related to irrigation and non-irrigation facilities.

Proposals made to the BLM for military activity on public land must be considered within the BLM's existing processes, including land use planning, NEPA, other natural resource and cultural resource laws and Executive Orders. The BLM may allow use of public land by any other Federal agency including Department of Defense only through rights-of-way, withdrawals or cooperative agreements. Any other use must be recognized as casual use. Activities recognized under casual use are defined as activities ordinarily resulting in no or negligible disturbance of the public land, resources, or improvements from any activity recognized by the BLM as a legitimate use of the public land. The following factors, and others as deemed appropriate, would be used in determining whether a proposed military activity of public lands may be considered casual use:

- Number of personnel involved in the activity;
- Type of vehicles to be used;
- Mode of travel involved – hiking versus use of vehicles;
- Cross-country travel versus use of existing roads;
- Number of days or overnights to conduct the activity;
- Specific area proposed for the activity;
- Proposed use of any existing features in the area such as caves, mine shafts, adits, tunnels, etc.

Any NEPA analysis of military use of public land must address why existing military land cannot accommodate the proposed use. Requests for new withdrawals of more than 1,000 acres of public land for military purposes must be accompanied by a signed approval to pursue this acquisition by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Requests for use of public land, other than withdrawal, must be accompanied by a signed approval by the appropriately delegated military official to pursue this action.

2.4.4.4.2 *Lands and Realty Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Land Tenure Adjustment: Public land with high resource values including WSA, ACECs and lands with wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs would generally be retained in public ownership and managed for multiple-use.

The BLM may consider land in retention zones for disposal in the event that such lands could be exchanged for higher value resource lands such as threatened or endangered species habitat, riparian areas, important historic or cultural resource sites, etc. Such changes must be in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions and be in the public interest.

The BLM would continue, as required, processing the “*Holloman Air Force Base Land Exchange Act*” (Public Law 109-470) of January 2007. This Act provides for a land exchange of private land and BLM-managed land in the vicinity of Holloman Air Force Base, Otero County, New Mexico, for the purpose of removing private land from the safety zone surrounding munitions storage bunkers at the air force base.

On lands identified for a specific disposal proposal, major arroyos identified in 100-year Flood Plain Zone maps developed by the Federal Emergency Management Administration would be surveyed and identified as separate parcels. The arroyo parcels would be retained in Federal ownership or transferred to the local government entity with a restrictive perpetual easement prohibiting those parcels from being developed. Specific criteria for determining which arroyos would be considered for such easements would be developed upon completion of the *TriCounty RMP*.

Prior to disposing of any land identified for disposal, the BLM would coordinate with local county, city, or other governmental entities including school districts to determine if such agencies or entities have an interest in acquiring any parcel within the proposed disposal for public purposes. This action is to ensure that local governments have opportunity to acquire sites for needed facilities or infrastructure to support growth that could result from the proposed disposal.

Existing classifications and segregations would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the classification or segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified, or terminated. A notice of termination and opening order would be published to notify the public when and to what extent the land would be opened, consistent with planning decisions. Land on which a classification or segregation has been terminated would be managed in the same manner and degree as surrounding or adjacent public land, including military or other agency withdrawals which might be terminated, in whole or in part.

The Las Cruces District would consider disposal or acquisition of split-estate where appropriate to improve resource management while protecting resource values. Federal minerals underlying non-Federal surface would generally be retained in Federal ownership; however, an exchange of mineral estate may be considered on a case-by-case basis if found to be in the public interest.

New withdrawals may be completed when existing law or regulation cannot adequately protect or preserve the integrity of resources of rarity, significance, fragility, or irreplaceably, or when valuable capital improvements are involved. They must be shown to be at risk by current land management practices. New withdrawal requests by other Federal agencies would be considered on a case-by-case basis where the public land transfer from one Federal agency to another or where resource values or agency investments are best protected by withdrawal. Land identified for retention may be considered for proposed withdrawals, on a case-by-case basis. The size of proposed withdrawals would be limited to the minimum acreage consistent with the demonstrated need. BLM policy would be to minimize the amount of land withdrawn in favor of cooperative use agreements that are more flexible. Land acquired through a withdrawal would be managed under the terms and conditions of the withdrawal.

Rights-of-Way, Permits, Leases, and Easements: Groundwater contamination as a result of hazardous chemical spills at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) White Sands Test Facility was discovered in the late 1980s. A ROW (NMNM66383) was granted to NASA and a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding (NM-030-45) was signed in April 1990 reserving public land for ground water monitoring wells. This land may need to be retained by the BLM to protect public safety.

Realty-related unauthorized use would be abated through prevention, detection, and resolution of such uses. Upon settlement of trespass liabilities, resolution of unauthorized use or development of public land would be accomplished through termination, authorization, or sale or exchange, as appropriate. The *TriCounty RMP/EIS* does not address, adjudicate, analyze or otherwise determine the validity of roads claimed under the Revised Statute (RS) 2477. Such assertions are acknowledged administratively or adjudicated by court decision.

Applications for leases, permits, and easements that do not involve surface disturbance or constructing permanent structures or facilities would be considered in avoidance and exclusion areas on a case-by-case basis and subject to appropriate NEPA analysis.

All valid existing rights, including leases, permits, easements, and withdrawals, are recognized and would be carried forward under all alternatives.

New ROWs would be allowed in exclusion areas if physical access or utility service to private or state inholdings within landlocked areas is necessary and alternative access is demonstrated to not be feasible. Special stipulations for exclusion areas would be applied to these authorizations.

No activity would be allowed which could result in obviously noticeable effects on the area of use by the average visitor to that area. Any use should fall well short of the BLM mandate to prevent undue and unnecessary degradation either from direct and immediate impacts or from cumulative impacts.

The BLM would monitor all instances of recognized casual use by the military to determine if such use went beyond or did not comply with any specified restrictions. Failure to comply could result in denying the military future use of public land.

2.4.4.4.3 *Lands and Realty Management Direction by Alternative*

TABLE 2-10				
PUBLIC LAND IDENTIFIED FOR DISPOSAL BY COUNTY BY ALTERNATIVE				
COUNTY	ALTERNATIVES/ACRES			
	A	B	C	D
Sierra	75,243	4,399	25,500	41,557
Otero	77,573	22,958	33,300	39,860
Doña Ana	60,383	10,916	49,650	105,106
TOTAL	213,199	38,273	108,450	186,523

Alternative A:

Land Disposal: In Doña Ana County, only land within disposal areas would be exchanged for land outside the (former) Mimbres Resource Area. To facilitate orderly disposal on the East Mesa (east of I-25), there are two disposal zones:

- First priority would be public land west of a north-south line 1 mile east of the boundary between R. 2 E. and R. 3 E.
- Second priority would be public land east of the line described above.

Certain parcels of land on the east side within disposal areas were set-aside by Memorandum of Understanding (signed August 17, 1982) with the City of Las Cruces and the Las Cruces School District No. 2 for disposal and future development under the R&PP Act. In addition, certain parcels were also set-aside within the 10,000-acre State Land Exchange Area east of Las Cruces for existing and potential R&PP Act lease or patent.

Land Retention: In the *Decision Area*, public land not identified as available for disposal would be retained in Federal ownership and managed according to provisions of Section 102(a) of FLPMA. However, land in this category may be exchanged for parcels that would enhance overall consolidation of public land. Public land within ACECs and other special management areas would not be disposed.

Land Acquisition: The BLM would acquire up to 116,000 acres of State trust land and 56,000 acres of private land within ACECs and WSAs through exchange or purchase at fair market value, from willing sellers. Acquisition of non-public land in special management areas, or land containing important historic, cultural, mineral, recreational, scientific, scenic, or fish and wildlife habitat values would be priorities.

For withdrawals where the BLM presently has management responsibility, all RMP decisions covering those areas would apply.

Utility Corridors: A total of 17,613 acres would be dedicated to utility corridors. In Sierra and Otero Counties, utility corridors would not be established. The co-locating and use of existing ROWs would be encouraged for future ROW grants to reduce the proliferation of ROWs. In Doña Ana County, major ROWs and utility lines would be managed as follows (Map 2-22):

- The east-west corridor near Vado, and others running north and south, would be confined to a width of ¼-mile.
- The corridor in the Anthony Gap area would be confined to a width of ½-mile; however, the Anthony Gap Corridor does not have identified boundaries.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas (Map 2-22): Avoidance – 13,222 acres

New ROWs would be avoided for the following areas:

- Butterfield Trail (¼-mile each side)
- Desert bighorn sheep areas
- VRM Class II areas

The following stipulations would apply to new facilities within avoidance areas:

- Facilities would not be located parallel to the Butterfield Trail.
- Facilities would not be located within ¼-mile of any stage station on the Butterfield Trail.
- Facilities would not be located in riparian areas.
- Access routes would be limited and considered on a case-by-case basis.

Major transmission lines (outside existing corridors) would be avoided within 5 miles of El Camino Real National Historic Trail (VRM Class II area). Lines perpendicular to the Trail would be allowed.

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas (Map 2-22): Exclusion – 518,839 acres

New ROWs including communication sites and renewable energy projects would be excluded in all WSAs, ACECs, the Research Natural Area and Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark.

Existing ROWs within exclusion areas are recognized as grandfathered, and operation, maintenance, and renewal of these facilities would be allowed to continue within the scope of the ROW grants.

Alternative B:

Land Disposal: A total of 38,273 acres of public land would be identified as available for disposal as shown in Table 2-10 and on Map 2-19.

Los Tules ACEC would be transferred to Mesilla Valley Bosque Park through and R&PP Act lease and eventual sale. As of August 2011, this process is ongoing.

The BLM would coordinate with local government entities including the school district prior to disposing of any parcel to meet public need for schools site, law enforcement and fire facilities and other infrastructure.

Land Retention: Public land with special designations such as WSAs or ACECs would be retained in Federal ownership. Public land outside of special designation areas not identified for disposal would generally be retained in Federal ownership. However, land in this category may be exchanged for land of higher resource value such as non-Federal lands within or adjacent to WSAs or ACECs, high-value wildlife habitat, high-value cultural resource sites, or other land as appropriate. These lands may also be disposed to serve public interest such as community expansion, R&PPs or similar needs.

Land Acquisition: The BLM would acquire non-Federal land located within or adjacent to ACECs and WSAs where appropriate. Land may be acquired through donation, purchase, or land exchange, including mineral estate, only from willing landowners. Land acquired within or adjacent to an ACEC or WSA would be inventoried to determine if the area meets the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation or if the area contains wilderness characteristics.

Where needed, land, interest in lands, or ROWs would be acquired to facilitate access to and across public land and resources, maintain or enhance public use and values, and provide for a more manageable land ownership pattern. During the acquisition process, specific management prescriptions for any acquired land would be prepared.

Withdrawals: Withdrawal actions would have the least restrictive measures and minimum size to accomplish the required purposes. Withdrawals no longer needed, in whole or in part, for the purpose for which they were withdrawn would be revoked or modified. Withdrawn areas returned to BLM administration would be managed consistent with land use plan decisions for the surrounding area, as appropriate.

Utility Corridors: See Map 2-23. Up to 149,835 acres would be dedicated to utility corridors.

- An east-west utility corridor, through Anthony Gap, extending from Luna County southeastward into Texas would be designated. The Corridor would be up to ½-mile width. (By definition, this Corridor would be outside the exclusion area of the Organ/Franklin Mountains ACEC.)
- A north-south utility corridor up to 0.5 miles wide from Anthony Gap through Doña Ana and Sierra Counties to connect with the Interstate-25 corridor would be designated.
- Additional ROW applications would be considered on a case-by-case basis both within and outside existing corridors.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas (Map 2-23): New ROWs would be avoided on 111,295 acres in the following areas:

- Jarilla Mountains ACEC
- Areas classified as VRM Class II
- Historic trails (½-mile each side)
- Aden Hills ERMA

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas (Map 2-23): New ROWs including communication sites would be excluded on 686,083 acres in the following areas:

- Lake Valley Back Country Byway (½-mile each side)
- Lake Valley SRMA
- Three Rivers Petroglyph SRMA
- Las Cruces SRMA
- All WSAs
- All existing and proposed ACECs, except for Jarilla Mountains ACEC
- Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark
- VRM Class I areas
- Areas of high and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model.
- Areas within 5 miles of Chiricahua leopard frog occupied habitat
- Intact grasslands and habitats (areas producing at or near reference state conditions)
- Areas of treated or restored vegetation
- Areas planned for vegetation treatment or restoration
- Within 5 miles each side of El Camino Real National Historic Trail.

Alternative C:

Land Disposal: A total of 108,450 acres would be available for disposal (Table 2-10 and Map 2-20).

Land parcels of interest by the Las Cruces School District or other governmental entity would be managed the same as under Alternative B.

Lands in ACECs, SRMAs or other special designation, except Congressional designations, may be transferred to another government entity (local, state or Federal) for similar management such as a county or State park or wildlife management area when management would be similar and it is in the interest of both agencies and the public to do so. Los Tules ACEC would be transferred to Mesilla Valley Bosque Park through an R&PP Act lease and eventual sale. As of August 2011, this process is ongoing.

Retention Lands: Public land with special designations such as WSAs, ACECs, and SRMAs, and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics under this alternative would be retained in Federal ownership.

Other public land not within special designations or identified as available for disposal would remain in Federal ownership. However, land in this category may be exchanged for land of higher resource value such as non-Federal land within or adjacent to WSAs or ACECs, high-value wildlife habitat, high-value cultural resource sites, or other land as appropriate. These lands may also be disposed to serve public interest such as community expansion, R&PPs, or similar needs.

Land Acquisition: Land acquisition actions under Alternative C would follow the same prescriptions and protocol described under Alternative B.

Withdrawals: Management of withdrawals under Alternative C would be the same as prescribed under Alternative B.

Utility Corridors: See Map 2-24. Up to 208,891 acres would be dedicated to utility corridors.

- An east-west corridor through Anthony Gap would be designated the same as Alternative B, except that the Corridor would be up to 2 miles wide.
- A north-south utility corridor up to 1-mile wide would be designated from Anthony Gap to connect with the Interstate 25 corridor near Truth or Consequences.
- Other ROW applications outside these areas would be managed the same as Alternative B.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas (Map 2-24): New ROWs, including communication sites and wind energy projects, would be avoided on 422,910 acres in the following areas:

- Tularosa Creek ACEC
- Sacramento Mountains ACEC
- Areas classified as VRM Class II
- Historic Trails (½-mile each side)
- SRMAs
- Elephant Butte ERMA
- Areas within 1-5 miles radius of Chiricahua leopard frog habitat

Major transmission lines (outside existing corridors) would be avoided within 5 miles of El Camino Real National Historic Trail (VRM Class II area). Lines perpendicular to the Trail would be allowed.

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas (Map 2-24): New ROWs, including communication sites and renewable energy projects, would be excluded on 343,058 acres in the following areas:

- Lake Valley Back Country Byway (½-mile each side)
- Lake Valley SRMA
- Three Rivers Petroglyph SRMA
- Las Cruces SRMA
- All WSAs
- All existing ACECs and those ACECs designated under this alternative,
- Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark
- VRM Class I areas
- Areas of high and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model and areas within one mile of Chiricahua leopard frog habitat

Alternative D:

Land Disposal: A total of 186,523 acres of public land would be identified as available for disposal (Table 2-10 and on Map 2-25).

Lands in ACECs, SRMAs or other special designation would be managed the same as in Alternative C.

Parcels of interest to the School District or other government agency would be managed the same as under Alternative A.

Land Retention: Public land in WSAs, ACECs, SRMAs, and lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative would be retained in Federal ownership.

Other public land not within special designations or identified as available for disposal would be managed as in Alternative C.

Land Acquisition: No efforts would be made to acquire non-Federal land under Alternative D; however, the BLM would consider proposals for exchange from other government agencies or private entities on a case-by-case basis.

Withdrawals: Management of withdrawals under Alternative D would be the same as Alternative B.

Utility Corridors: Up to 224,875 acres would be dedicated to utility corridors. An east-west corridor through Anthony Gap would be designated the same as Alternative C. A north-south corridor up to 2 miles wide and following the existing powerlines would be designated from Anthony Gap to connect with the I-25 corridor near Truth or Consequences.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas (Map 2-25): New ROWs including communication sites would be on 453,000 acres in the following areas:

- Lake Valley Back Country Byway (½-mile each side)
- Doña Ana Mountain ACEC
- San Diego Mountain ACEC
- Cornudas Mountains ACEC
- Alamo Mountain. ACEC
- Wind Mountain ACEC
- Alkali Lakes ACEC
- VRM Class I and II areas
- Historic trails (¼-mile each side)
- Butterfield Trail
- Aden Hills ERMA
- Caballo Mountains ERMA
- Elephant Butte ERMA
- Las Cruces SRMA
- Red Sands ERMA
- Talavera ERMA
- Areas of high and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas (Map 2-25): New ROWs including communication sites would be excluded on 308,000 acres in the following areas:

- Lake Valley SRMA
- Three Rivers Petroglyph SRMA
- Tularosa Creek SRMA
- All WSAs
- Organ/Franklin Mountains ACEC
- Los Tules ACEC
- Robledo Mountains ACEC
- Doña Ana Mountains ACEC
- Rincon ACEC
- Three Rivers Petroglyph Site
- Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark
- 36,000 acres aplomado falcon habitat on Otero Mesa and Nutt Grassland

2.4.4.5 RENEWABLE ENERGY

ROWs for renewable energy, such as wind, solar, biomass, and other alternative energy sources would be authorized and permitted under the Lands and Realty Program. Avoidance and exclusion areas noted in the alternatives under the lands and realty program would also apply to renewable energy siting. However, since this issue has been the subject of three multi-state programmatic EISs within the BLM, one of which is still in preparation, this issue should be separated from the proposed actions and decisions under the Lands and Realty Program. In all cases, the prescriptions described in the various alternatives herein are consistent with the following BLM Programmatic EISs: *Wind Energy Development Programmatic EIS* (BLM 2005b), *Resource Management Plan Amendments for Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States* (BLM 2008c), *Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States Final Programmatic EIS* (BLM 2012c), and the *Final Programmatic Energy Corridor EIS* (2008a). The Decisions from these documents are incorporated by reference into the *TriCounty RMP*.

Goal:

- Provide direction for the development of renewable energy projects including determining potential locations and management parameters in order to assist the United States in increasing the development and use of alternative energy sources.

Objectives

- To manage areas potentially suitable for renewable energy development to reduce impacts of such development to other resources and resource uses.
- Incorporate policy, management guidance and Best Management Practices from programmatic studies to utility-scale renewable energy projects during the project permitting process.

2.4.4.5.1 *Renewable Energy Continuing Management Guidance*

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Title II, Section 211) establishes a goal for the Secretary of the Interior to approve 10,000 megawatts (MWs) of electricity from non-hydropower renewable energy projects located on public land. In December 2005, the BLM issued a Record of Decision on the *Wind Energy*

Development Programmatic EIS (BLM 2005b). Following the publication of the EIS, the BLM published updated guidance on processing wind energy applications on BLM land (IM 2009-043). This guidance specifically addressed VRM, wildlife and migratory birds, ACECs, and avoidance and exclusion areas and provided numerous best management practices and stipulations that would apply to a wind energy project. Testing facilities and the wind energy project would be authorized by FLPMA ROW grants.

Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States Final Programmatic EIS (BLM 2012c) addresses utility-scale solar energy policy and guidance, and solar energy project siting on public land. It defines solar project policy, describes best management practices, and identifies solar energy zones (SEZ) potentially suitable for solar project development.

Although BLM considers geothermal energy a renewable energy resource, it is discussed in the minerals section because it is permitted as a leasable mineral and not under a ROW as are wind and solar energy projects. Transmission lines that may be required to move renewable energy from production source to utilization point are discussed under the Lands and Realty section for ROW avoidance and exclusion areas and utility corridors.

2.4.4.5.2 *Renewable Energy Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

The NEPA process for any proposed wind or solar projects would be tiered to the *Wind Energy Development Programmatic EIS* (BLM 2005b), *Solar Energy Development Final Programmatic EIS* (BLM 2012c), and the *Final Programmatic Energy Corridor EIS* (BLM 2008c) as appropriate. The siting requirements, best management practices, and programmatic mitigation identified in the programmatic renewable energy EISs would be incorporated into any NEPA analysis as appropriate.

Avoidance areas are those areas where project siting is not desirable because of environmental impacts; however, projects may be sited with certain stipulations to eliminate or reduce impacts. The preferred alternative identified in the *Solar Energy Development Programmatic EIS* does not identify avoidance areas, only exclusion areas. In keeping with this, no avoidance areas were identified in the alternatives for solar development. Exclusion areas are those where projects would not be allowed unless required by law. Areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion would be open on a case-by-case basis.

Utility scale renewable energy projects would be excluded from all VRM Class I areas, existing ACECs, and WSAs. Where wind energy projects and transmission lines intersect with VRM Class II and in some cases VRM Class III, an RMP amendment for VRM would, in most cases, be necessary.

Under all alternatives, wind energy projects would follow the BLM Las Cruces District Wildlife Monitoring Protocol Minimum Standards for Wind Energy Projects as shown in Appendix D.

2.4.4.5.3 *Renewable Energy Management Direction by Alternative*

Alternative A: Applications for utility scale solar or wind energy projects would be accepted, processed and analyzed on a case-by-case basis as a FLPMA right-of-way. If the *Solar Energy Development Draft Programmatic EIS and Record of Decision* is completed before the Record of Decision for this RMP/EIS is issued, the alternative selected in that programmatic EIS would become the No Action Alternative for the *TriCounty RMP/EIS*.

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas for Solar and Wind Projects:

- Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail (37 miles)(¼-mile buffer)
- WSAs
- ACECs
- Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark
- VRM Class I

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas for Solar and Wind Projects:

- Mormon Battalion Trail, Butterfield Trail and Lake Valley Backcountry Byway(¼-mile buffer)
- VRM Class II
- Within 5 miles of El Camino Real National Historic Trail VRM Class II area.

Under Alternative A, 532,000 acres would be avoidance or exclusion areas for both solar and wind energy projects (Map 2-33).

Alternatives B, C, and D: No avoidance areas are identified for utility scale solar energy projects, only Exclusion Areas.

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas: The following areas would be exclusion areas for utility scale wind energy projects:

- Wilderness Study Areas
- Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
- Existing ACECs and proposed ACECs
- Historic Trails
- Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark
- VRM Class I
- VRM Class II
- Playas and Riparian areas
- Special Recreation Management Areas
- Intact Desert Grasslands
- ACECs newly designated under each Alternative, except for Jarilla Mountains.

Alternative B: Under this alternative, the Afton SEZ (29,964 acres) southwest of Las Cruces and described in the *Solar Energy Development Final Programmatic EIS* (2012c) would be the only area available for siting solar energy projects in the TriCounty *Decision Area*. EIS-level NEPA analysis would be required as part of the permitting process. Other sites outside the Afton Solar Energy Zone would not be considered.

Wind energy projects would be considered throughout the *Decision Area* in technically suitable locations outside avoidance and exclusion areas prescribed under this alternative (See Map 2-35). Applications would be accepted and processing would be done on a case-by-case basis using EIS-level NEPA analysis.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas: The following areas would be avoidance areas for utility scale wind energy projects:

- Jarilla Mountains
- Restore New Mexico areas completed and planned
- Special Status Species habitat
- Habitat Management Plan Areas and wildlife waters
- Mormon Battalion Trail, Butterfield Trail and Lake Valley Back Country Byway (½-mile buffer)

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas: The following areas would be exclusion areas for utility scale wind and solar energy projects:

- High and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model. At the time of an application, field surveys would be conducted to verify the accuracy of the model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area (see Map 2-31 and 2-35).
- Within ¼-mile of prairie dog colonies
- Within a 5-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat.
- Within ½-mile of historic trails
- Camino Real de Tierra Adentro NHT (37 miles) (½-mile buffer)
- Solar and wind projects would be excluded from high and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model (Young et al. 2002). At the time of an application, field surveys would be conducted to verify the accuracy of the model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area (see Map 2-31 and 2-35).

Solar energy projects would be excluded on 2,759,149 acres of the *Decision Area*. Wind energy projects would be avoided or excluded on 1,598,929 acres of the *Decision Area*. These acres are not additive as many areas of avoidance and exclusion overlap, depending on proposed type of use.

Alternative C: The Afton SEZ would be the priority area for siting solar energy projects. The appropriate NEPA analysis, either environmental assessment or EIS, would be done as part of the permitting process. Areas outside the Afton SEZ and outside exclusion areas (Map 2-32) may be considered for solar energy projects on a case-by-case basis through the appropriate level of NEPA analysis.

Wind energy projects would be considered throughout the *Decision Area* in technically suitable locations outside avoidance and exclusion areas. Application and processing would be done on a case-by-case basis using the appropriate level of NEPA analysis.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas: The following areas would be avoidance areas for wind energy projects and exclusion areas for solar energy projects:

- High and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model (Young 2002). At the time of an application, field surveys would be conducted to verify the accuracy of the model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area (see Map 2-32 and 2-36).
- Within ¼-mile of prairie dog colonies
- HMP areas and wildlife waters
- Restore New Mexico areas (completed and planned projects)
- Intact grasslands
- Special status plant species habitat
- Between 1- and 5-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat
- Camino Real de Tierra Adentro NHT (37 miles) (½-mile buffer)
- Mormon Battalion Trail, Butterfield Trail and Lake Valley Back Country Byway (½-mile buffer)

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas: The following areas would be exclusion areas for utility scale solar and wind energy projects:

- Existing ACECs and ACECs newly designated under this Alternative, except for Jarilla Mountains
- Within a 1-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat
- Existing WSAs
- Riparian habitat and playas as shown on District GIS data

Solar energy projects would be excluded on 1,617,996 acres in the *Decision Area*. Wind energy projects would be avoided or excluded on 1,610,456 acres in the *Decision Area*. These acres are not additive as many areas of avoidance and exclusion overlap depending on proposed type of use.

Alternative D: The Afton SEZ would be the priority for siting proposed solar energy sites. The appropriate level of NEPA analysis, either environmental assessment or EIS, would be completed as part of the permitting process. Other areas outside the Afton SEZ and exclusion areas (Map 2-33) may be considered for solar energy projects on a case-by-case basis through the appropriate level of NEPA analysis.

Rights-of-Way Avoidance Areas: Avoidance areas for Wind Projects in Alternative D:

- Mormon Battalion Trail, Butterfield Trail and Lake Valley Backcountry Byway (¼-mile buffer)
- Riparian habitat and playas
- Special Recreation Management Areas
- High and moderate potential aplomado falcon habitat. Field surveys would need to be conducted at the time of application to verify the accuracy of the habitat model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area.
- Within ¼-mile of prairie dog colonies
- HMP areas and wildlife waters
- Restore New Mexico areas completed and planned
- Intact grasslands
- Special status species habitat
- Geothermal leasing would be avoided within a 1-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat.

Rights-of-Way Exclusion Areas: Wind and Solar Projects would not be built in the following Exclusion Areas:

- 36,000 acres of aplomado falcon core habitat located on Otero Mesa and the Nutt Grasslands (see Maps 2-33 and 2-37).
- Camino Real de Tierra Adentro NHT (37 miles) (¼-mile buffer)

Solar energy projects would be excluded on 1,562,616 acres in the *Decision Area*. Wind energy projects would be avoided or excluded on 1,532,657 acres in the *Decision Area*. These acres are not additive as many areas of avoidance and exclusion overlap, depending on the proposed type of use.

Outside of avoidance and exclusion areas wind energy projects would be considered throughout the *Decision Area* where conditions are suitable.

2.4.4.6 MINERALS

Mineral resources in the *Planning Area* include fluid minerals such as geothermal and oil and gas; hard rock minerals such as gold, silver, copper, lead, and tin; and mineral material such as sand, gravel and building stone. Mineral material extraction is the most active mineral program in the *Planning Area* particularly around Las Cruces, which is experiencing expansion.

In 2005, the BLM issued the *RMP Amendment for Federal Fluid Mineral Leasing and Development in Sierra and Otero Counties* (See Chapter 1). However, an appeal of that document led to a Tenth Circuit Court decision invalidating its decisions. Consequently, the oil and gas leasing programs in the *Decision Area* are governed by the *White Sands* and *White Sands RMPs*. These decisions do not comply with current BLM policy for onshore oil and gas leasing and do not provide sufficient and appropriate management options or guidance for oil and gas leasing. In the case of Otero Mesa, additional information on the Salt Basin Aquifer and potential impacts to the aquifer, updated information on oil and gas potential, as well as in depth information on potential impacts to wildlife and vegetation habitats of the Mesa, should be compiled and evaluated before a leasing program can be properly implemented and managed. All new leasing would be deferred until further land use planning is completed. The Las Cruces District Office has chosen to prepare a programmatic RMP amendment for oil and gas leasing and development after the ROD for the *TriCounty RMP* is issued.

As a valid existing right, any areas currently under lease would be managed according to existing regulations and lease terms and conditions until the lease expires; this would not be changed by new land use plan decisions.

Goal:

- Provide opportunities for mineral exploration and extraction for locatable, saleable and geothermal minerals, and to defer new oil and gas leasing until a future programmatic EIS is prepared on public land consistent with the Federal leasing laws and existing policy while preventing undue and unnecessary impacts on the environment.

Objectives:

- Manage mineral resource exploration and development with the minimum restrictions and stipulations necessary to protect other resources and resource uses on a case-by-case basis.
- Propose withdrawals from locatable mineral entry only when justified and appropriate to protect other resources.
- Ensure that locatable mining operations (notices and plans of operation) consider all resources in the local environment and apply best management practices to minimize mining or exploration impacts.
- Provide opportunities for development of mineral material resources to support community and infrastructure needs.

2.4.4.6.1 *Minerals Continuing Management Guidance*

Federal laws require the Federal government to facilitate the development of mineral resources to meet national, regional, and local needs for domestic and defensive purposes. The BLM is responsible for

assuring that mineral development is carried out in a manner that minimizes environmental damage and provides for rehabilitation of affected land. Most public land in the *Planning Area* is available for mineral entry, except where restricted by withdrawals for military, conservation, or other specific purposes.

Policy guidance for managing mineral resources is provided in several pieces of legislation as well as in the *BLM Manual* and handbooks. The key directives are that (1) public land is to be managed for multiple-use and (2) if it is determined to be necessary to place certain areas under special management, then that management must be the least restrictive necessary to protect the resource of concern to ensure that the area remains open to other uses. In areas of split-estate (i.e. where the United States owns all or some of the mineral estate and another entity owns the surface estate), the surface owner or manager is primarily responsible for developing access agreements with the mineral resource developer that protects their surface resources. The surface owner may not deny the action. Federal mineral estate underlying land managed or owned by other entities would be managed by the BLM in accordance with applicable plans and in cooperation with the surface owner or manager.

The BLM ROD for the *Resource Management Plan Amendments for Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States* (1) allocated BLM land as open to be considered for geothermal leasing or closed for geothermal leasing; (2) developed a reasonably foreseeable development scenario that indicated a potential for 12,210-megawatts of electrical generating capacity from 244 power plants by 2025, plus additional direct uses of geothermal resources; and (3) adopted stipulations, best management practices, and procedures for geothermal leasing and development. The ROD amended the *White Sands* and *Mimbres RMPs* for areas open or closed for geothermal leasing. Decisions applicable to the *TriCounty Planning Area* are carried forward in this RMP (USDO IBLM 2008c).

Locatable mineral resources include metallic minerals (e.g., gold, silver, uranium) and certain nonmetallic minerals (e.g., gemstones, fluorspar, and high purity limestone). Locatable mineral extraction would be allowed on all public domain land unless withdrawn or segregated from mineral entry. Any withdrawal or segregation of public land from mineral entry is subject to valid existing rights. Mining claim location, prospecting, and mining operations are allowed in WSAs but only in a manner that will not impair the suitability of an area for inclusion in the wilderness preservation system.

Salable minerals, also known as mineral materials, are sand, gravel, building stone, etc. and their use is authorized by free-use permits and over-the-counter sales, competitive sales and negotiated sales. Mineral materials under Title 23 rights-of-way are granted to the Federal Highway Administration for Federally-funded highway construction or maintenance projects and are not included as salable minerals. The *Decision Area* would be generally open to mineral material disposal except for specific areas designated closed.

2.4.4.6.2 *Minerals Management Decisions Common to All Alternatives*

Geothermal leasing and development would incorporate, as appropriate, the findings, decisions, stipulations and mitigations contained in the Record of Decision for the *Resource Management Plan Amendments for Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States* (BLM 2008c).

Within the *Decision Area*, some locations are non-discretionarily closed to exploration or extraction of one or more types of mineral by law, regulation, executive or secretarial order. Non-discretionary closures cannot be changed administratively by the BLM. These closures would be observed under all alternatives. These closures include all WSAs (closed to mineral leasing, but not to claims under the 1872 Mining Law); and small areas in Sierra and Otero Counties formerly used by the military. Non-

discretionary closures totaling approximately 258,186 acres of Federal mineral estate in the *Decision Area* would be common to all alternatives.

Discretionary closures are administrative decisions and are made in land use planning documents such as RMPs. Discretionary closures can be applied to leasable minerals and mineral materials, but not to locatable minerals, as withdrawal from locatable mineral entry can only be made by Act of Congress, or order of the Interior Secretary. In those alternatives where existing ACEC designations are continued, those ACECs which are discretionarily closed to fluid mineral leasing would continue to be closed pending further planning for oil and gas.

The Abandoned Mine Lands program of inventory, assessment and remediation of abandoned mine features would continue. Any required NEPA analysis for remediation or reclamation of mine features would be done on a mining district or other site-specific basis and tiered to this RMP/ EIS.

No proposed decisions are listed for coal due to the very limited resource potential in the *Planning Area*. Any future coal leasing, should it occur, would be done according to applicable laws and regulations in areas identified as potentially suitable for coal leasing.

Under all alternatives, 5,364 acres in the Sacramento Escarpment ACEC would continue to be withdrawn from entry under the mining laws (Public Land Order [PLO] No. 7375) until 2019. The area would remain open to mineral leasing. Another 5,612 acres in the Organ Mountains and Three Rivers Petroglyph Site would continue to be segregated from all mineral entry to protect recreational and historic values. (Notice of Classification of Public Lands for Multiple Use Management, *Federal Register*, Vol. 35, No. 69, April 9, 1970).

Under all alternatives, Community Pit #1, located in Doña Ana County off of Shalem Colony Road (T. 22 S., R. 1 E., Section 19, S½SE¼), would be recommended for withdrawal of locatable minerals.

Under all alternatives, authorizations for use of existing mineral material pits would continue as needed and appropriate. Existing authorizations are shown in Appendix M. New mineral material pits would be established as needed in open areas where the resource is available.

Fluid mineral leasing decisions are shown on Maps 2-26 to 2-29. Table 2-11 shows a summary of proposed fluid minerals management by alternative. Mineral material decisions are shown on Maps 2-38 to 2-41.

All new R&PP lease or patent areas would be closed to geothermal leasing or designated as no surface occupancy.

Existing fluid mineral leases would continue on 52,705 acres. As a valid existing right, any areas currently under lease would be managed according to existing regulations and lease terms and conditions until the lease expires or is relinquished by the leaseholder; this would not be changed by new land use plan decisions. Mitigation measures for surface disturbing activities would be developed and applied as needed to protect paleontological resources, including a controlled surface-use stipulation for leases.

TABLE 2-11 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FLUID MINERALS MANAGEMENT BY ALTERNATIVE				
RESTRICTIONS	A	B	C	D
OIL AND GAS LEASING				
Nondiscretionary Closure	258,186	258,186	258,186	258,186
Discretionary Closure ¹	75,020	75,020	75,020	75,020
Open – NSO Stipulation	27,534	856 ²	856 ²	856 ²
Open – CSU Stipulation	169,710	0	0	0
Open with Lease Notice	239,307	0	0	0
Open – SLTC	3,655,138	0	0	0
Existing Leases	52,705	52,705	52,705	52,705
ACRES DEFERRED FROM OIL AND GAS LEASING				
Deferred pending further planning	0	3,593,047	3,593,047	3,593,047
GEOTHERMAL LEASING				
Nondiscretionary Closure	258,186	258,186	258,186	258,186
Discretionary Closure ¹	75,020	571,930	358,045	75,020
Open – NSO Stipulation	27,534	856	856	856
Open – CSU Stipulation	169,710	0	0	0
Open with Lease Notice	239,307	0	0	0
Open – SLTC	3,194,610	3,154,014	3,222,397	3,630,721
NOTES:				
¹ Discretionary closure applies only to areas of existing ACECs outside WSAs. Any area within a WSA is part of a nondiscretionary closure. This also includes Kilbourne Hole.				
² Rincon ACEC in Doña Ana County				

2.4.4.6.3 Minerals Management Direction by Alternative

FLUID MINERALS

Alternative A:

Oil and Gas Leasing: Under Alternative A, the following existing management decisions for oil and gas leasing would apply:

- 258,186 acres in WSAs and former military use areas would be non-discretionarily closed to leasing
- 75,020 acres in existing ACECs (outside WSAs) and Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark would be discretionarily closed to fluid minerals leasing
- 27,534 acres in R&PP sites, ecological study sites, recreation sites, historical trails and communication sites would be open to leasing with No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation
- 169,710 acres in the Jornada Experimental Range (109,461 acres), NMSU Chihuahuan Desert Rangeland Research Center (60,249 acres) would be open with a Controlled Surface Use Stipulation
- 239,307 acres in the WSMR Safety Evacuation Zone in Sierra County would be open with a Lease Notice
- 3,655,138 acres of Federal mineral estate in the *Planning Area* would be open with Standard Lease Terms and Conditions (SLTC)

Alternatives A and D:

Geothermal Leasing: Under Alternatives A and D, the following restrictions would apply:

- 258,186 acres in WSAs and former military use areas would be non-discretionarily closed to leasing
- 75,020 acres in existing ACECs and Kilbourne Hole National Natural Landmark would be discretionarily closed to leasing
- 27,534 acres in R&PP sites, ecological study sites, recreation sites, historical trails and communication sites would be open to leasing with No Surface Occupancy stipulation
- 169,710 acres in the Jornada Experimental Range (109,461 acres) and NMSU Chihuahua Desert Rangeland Research Center (60,249) would be open with a Controlled Surface Use stipulation
- 239,307 acres in the WSMR Safety Evacuation Zone in Sierra County would be open with a Lease Notice
- 3,655,138 acres of Federal mineral estate in the *Planning Area* would be open with Standard Lease Terms and Conditions. However, since fluid mineral leasing is a discretionary action, any lease application may be denied if during NEPA analysis of the action it was determined that unacceptable impacts could accrue to other resources
- Geothermal would be avoided within 5 miles of El Camino Real National Historic Trail (VRM Class II area)
- Restore New Mexico Areas (completed and planned projects) would be avoided.

Alternatives B, C and D:

Oil and Gas Leasing: Under Alternatives B, C and D, existing discretionary and non-discretionary closures to oil and gas leasing would continue. All WSAs and certain former military use areas totaling 258,186 acres would be non-discretionarily closed to oil and gas leasing. Existing ACECs totaling 85,484 acres would continue to be discretionarily closed to oil and gas leasing. The ACEC acreage includes the existing boundaries of the Cornudas, Wind Mountain, and Alamo Mountain ACECs. Although these areas would be incorporated into the Otero Mesa Grassland ACEC under Alternative B, the existing boundaries would continue to be closed to fluid mineral leasing.

For the mineral estate in the remainder of the *Planning Area* outside of existing discretionary and nondiscretionary closures, oil and gas leasing would be deferred until such time as a programmatic RMP amendment can be prepared addressing oil and gas leasing and management including identifying areas open and closed to leasing and new leasing stipulations. No new leasing would be allowed in the *Planning Area* until that Plan Amendment is completed.

Alternatives B and C:

Geothermal Leasing: Under Alternatives B and C, the Federal fluid mineral estate (approximately 62,000 acres) beneath the NMSU Rangeland Research Center, would be discretionarily closed to geothermal leasing. In the remainder of the *Planning Area*, the fluid mineral leasing restrictions for Alternative A would also apply to geothermal leasing under Alternatives B and C.

Geothermal leasing would be excluded from high and moderate aplomado falcon habitat as prescribed by the habitat model. At the time of an application, field surveys would be conducted to verify the accuracy of the model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area (see Map 2-27 and 2-28).

Alternative B:

Geothermal Leasing: Geothermal leasing would be excluded within a 5-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat.

Alternative C:

Geothermal Leasing: Geothermal leasing would be excluded within a 1-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat and avoided between 1- and 5-mile radius of occupied habitat.

Alternative D:

Geothermal Leasing: Geothermal leasing would be avoided within a 1-mile radius of occupied Chiricahua leopard frog habitat. Leasing would be excluded in 36,000 acres of aplomado falcon “core” habitat located on Otero Mesa and the Nutt Grasslands (see Maps 2-29). It would be avoided in high and moderate potential aplomado falcon habitat throughout the rest of the *Decision Area*. Field surveys would need to be conducted at the time of application to verify the accuracy of the habitat model and determine if falcon habitat exists in the application area.

LOCATABLE MINERALS

Alternative A: All public land and mineral estate in the *Planning Area* would be open to entry and location under the mining laws except for withdrawn or segregated areas (10,977 acres).

Approximately 71,488 acres in existing ACECs would be recommended to be withdrawn from location under the general mining laws.

Alternative B: All public land and mineral estate in the *Planning Area* would be open to entry and location under the mining laws except for withdrawn or segregated areas (10,977 acres).

The following areas would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (682,407 acres):

- Existing WSAs (252,704 acres)
- Existing ACECs (except Sacramento Escarpment) (85,249 acres)
- Lake Valley SRMA (1,000 acres)
- Proposed ACECs
 - Brokeoff Mountains ACEC (61,224 acres)
 - Six Shooter Canyon ACEC (1,060 acres)
 - Percha Creek ACEC (870 acres)
 - Broad Canyon ACEC (4,721 acres)
 - Tortugas Mountain ACEC (1,936 acres)
 - Otero Mesa Grassland ACEC (271,262 acres)
 - Sacramento Mountains ACEC (2,381 acres)

Alternative C: All public land and mineral estate in the *Planning Area* would be open to entry and location under the mining laws except for withdrawn or segregated areas (10,977 acres).

The following areas totaling 337,807 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from location under the general mining laws:

- Existing WSAs (261,793 acres)
- Alamo Mountain ACEC (2,528 acres)
- Cornudas Mountain ACEC (852 acres)
- Doña Ana Mountains ACEC (3,181 acres)
- Organ Franklin/Mountains ACEC (58,417 acres)
- Rincon ACEC (856 acres)
- Three Rivers Petroglyph ACEC (1,043 acres)
- Wind Mountain ACEC (2,308 acres)
- Mud Mountain ACEC (2,579 acres)
- Percha Creek ACEC (870 acres)
- Six Shooter ACEC (1,060 acres)
- Lake Valley SRMA (1,000 acres)
- VanWinkle Lake ACEC (1,320 acres)

Alternative D: A total of 53,765 acres in the Organ/Franklin Mountains ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. All other public land and mineral estate would be open to entry and location under the mining laws except for withdrawn or segregated areas (10,977 acres).

MINERAL MATERIALS

Alternative A: The following areas would be closed to mineral material disposal:

- All WSAs (261,793 acres)
- All ACECs designated and managed under this alternative (89,723 acres)
- Research Natural Area (one area in the Aden Lava Flow WSA) (3,700 acres)
- Kilbourne Hole Natural National Landmark (5,500 acres)
- No lands with wilderness characteristics were identified under existing management (0 acres)

All remaining areas in the *Planning Area*, including subsurface estate would be open to mineral material disposal pending site-specific environmental assessment at the time of a sale application.

Alternative B: The following areas would be closed to mineral material disposal:

- All WSAs (261,793 acres)
- All existing and proposed ACECs designated and managed under this alternative (517,774 acres)
- Kilbourne Hole Natural National Landmark (5,500 acres)
- Four areas managed as lands with wilderness characteristics (11,494 acres)

All remaining areas in the *Planning Area*, including subsurface estate would be open to mineral material disposal pending site-specific environmental assessment at the time of a sale application.

Alternative C: The following areas would be closed to mineral material disposal:

- All WSAs (261,793 acres)
- Existing and proposed ACECs designated and managed under this alternative, except for Otero Grassland which would only be closed in VRM I (111,219 acres)
- Kilbourne Hole Natural National Landmark (5,500 acres)
- Three areas managed as lands with wilderness characteristics (803 acres)

Alternative D: The following areas would be closed to mineral material disposal:

- All WSAs (261,793 acres)
- All existing ACECs managed under this alternative (85,978 acres)
- Kilbourne Hole Natural National Landmark (5,500 acres)
- No areas managed as lands with wilderness characteristics

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2-12 shows a summary of the impacts by alternative and resource and resource use.

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS				
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Controlled surface disturbance, closed routes, vehicle use in existing ACECs limited to designated routes, and excluded new ROW would protect relevant and important resources and maintain resource conditions.	89,723 acres 3% of <i>Decision Area</i> 13 ACECs	517,774 acres 18% of <i>Decision Area</i> 29 ACECs	304,042 acres 14% of <i>Decision Area</i> 23 ACECs	85,978 acres 3% of <i>Decision Area</i> 12 ACECs
Wilderness Study Areas				
Management under BLM Manual 6330 would protect wilderness values and lead to rehabilitation of disturbed areas.	Vehicle use limited to Existing Routes at time of WSA designation.	Close all routes in WSAs.	Peña Blanca and Organ Needle routes closed.	Vehicle use limited to Existing Routes at time of WSA designation.
Wild and Scenic Rivers				
Preserve the classification of eligible rivers.	0.0 miles	3.5 miles	0.0 miles	1.4 miles
LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
Designating Nutt Grasslands, Bar Canyon, and or Peña Blanca as LWC would protect wilderness values, restrict vehicle use, close to new ROW which reduces surface disturbance.	No designation.	Designate Nutt Grasslands and Bar Canyon, Peña Blanca South and Peña Blanca North.	Designate Bar Canyon, Peña Blanca South, and Peña Blanca North.	Designate Bar Canyon.
AIR RESOURCES				
Air Quality				
Limiting vehicle use to designated or existing routes would reduce fugitive dust.	40% of <i>Decision Area</i>	99% of <i>Decision Area</i>	99% of <i>Decision Area</i>	99% of <i>Decision Area</i>
Oil and gas leasing deferred from leasing precludes any impacts to air quality.	0 acres deferred	3,600,000 acres	3,600,000 acres	3,600,000 acres
SOIL AND WATER				
Surface disturbances by OHV use leads to soil erosion, compaction and increased run-off.	1.6 million acres in Sierra and Otero Open to OHV.	Limit vehicle use on 2 million acres.	Limit vehicle use on 2.2 million acres.	Limit vehicle use on 2.5 million acres.
Soils protected in areas closed to vehicle use.	42,953 acres	259,891 acres	20,000 acres	17,485 acres
Vegetation treatments would reduce soil exposure and erosion in the long-term and improve water quality.	No Decision.	Passive Restoration would be improve fewer acres than A.	Passive and active methods improve soil stability and productivity greater extent than A & B.	Active methods would increase the acres restored and increase ground cover and reduce erosion.

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
VEGETATION AND WOODLANDS				
OHV open areas lead to degradation of soils and vegetation.	1.6 million acres open	39,000 acres open	42,000 acres open	42,000 acres open
ROW Avoidance and Exclusion reduce impacts to vegetation from surface disturbances associated with communications sites, utilities and roads.	532,061 acres	1,029,027 acres	765,970 acres	761,000 acres
Route closures in WSAs lead to vegetation recovery.	0	164 miles	4.0 miles	0
Passive and Active restoration leads to desired states and conditions, reduces opportunities for weeds.	No Decision.	Passive Restoration would be improve fewer acres than A.	Passive and active methods improve vegetation conditions to a greater extent than A & B.	Active methods would increase the rate of restoration.
Lands closed to grazing would improve recreation sites, degraded or special riparian sites, and wildlife waters.	2,049 acres	17,602 acres + allotments with unmanageable conflicts based on basic evidence.	17,602 acres + allotments with unmanageable conflicts that have had evaluation and monitoring.	1,156 acres
FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT				
ROW Avoidance and Exclusion would maintain large areas of diverse, productive habitats.	532,061 acres	1,029,027 acres	765,970 acres	761,000 acres
Habitat would potentially be degraded by OHV designations, and other development.	1,738,000 acres	247,000 acres	383,000 acres	434,000 acres
Mitigations would improve and protect habitats	376,000 acres	1,524,000 acres	1,722,000 acres	1,681,000 acres
Habitat and vegetation restoration rates vary on whether active or passive methods are used . Increases in vegetation may be allocated to wildlife, watershed, or livestock.	No Decision	Passive restoration leads to fewer acres restored compared to A. Increases in vegetation reserved for watershed and wildlife.	Passive and active methods lead to greater restoration rates than A or B. Increases allocated to wildlife and livestock, with wildlife a priority.	Active methods improve more acreage but vegetation increases would be allocated for livestock.
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
ACECs protect special status species habitats (number, acres).	6 75,000	10 356,000 acres	6 212,000 acres	6 75,000
Aplomado falcon releases leads to viable populations	No decision	Yes	Yes	No

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
Special status species habitat potentially degraded by OHV designations, land disposals, energy and mineral development.	1,738,000 acres	247,000 acres	383,000 acres	434,000 acres
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Cultural resources would potentially degraded by OHV designations	1.64 million acres	39,000 acres	42,000 acres	42,000 acres
ACECs for cultural resources would reduce surface disturbance to sites such as habitation sites and lithic scatters (numbers/acres).	8 existing/62,390 acres	8 existing/62,390 acres 5 proposed/352,393 acres	8 existing/62,390 acres 3 proposed./344,261 acres	8 existing/62,390 acres
Areas closed to livestock grazing reduces disturbance to cultural resources.	2,049 acres	At least 17,602 acres	At least 17,602 acres	1,156 acres
PALEONTOLOGY				
Paleo resources potentially degraded by OHV designations	1.64 million acres	39,000 acres	42,000 acres	42,000 acres
ACECs and SRMAs would reduce surface disturbance and prevent fossil destruction.	90,000 acres ACECs 69,000 acres SRMAs	512,000 acres ACECs 83,000 acres SRMAs	439,000 acres ACECs 83,000 acres SRMAs	87,000 acres ACECs 83,230 acres SRMAs
Applying fossil yield classification to all surface disturbing activities would screen out locations with likelihood of paleo resources.	No Decision	Yes	Yes	Yes
VISUAL RESOURCES				
Designated utility corridors would confine major rights-of-ways to reduce impacts to visual values.	No corridors in Sierra and Otero Counties Vado ¼-mile width Anthony Gap ½-mile width	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be ½-mile width Anthony Gap 1 mile width	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be 1 mile width Anthony Gap 1 mile width.	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be 2 miles in width
Allowable levels of impacts (VRM) compared to the actual evaluation (VRI) of visual values.	Protects more visual values than C or D.	Protects most of the visual values.	Protects more visual values than D, less than B	Protects the least amount of visual values.
FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
Potential to restore or maintain historic fire regime.	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate
Fire used as a tool for restoration in conjunction with herbicide treatments and grazing leads to more sustainable vegetation communities and sustainable historic fire regimes.	More frequent fire in the long-term but historic regime altered.	Fire as a tool excluded, historic fire regime altered.	Historic fire regime restored.	Historic fire regime not sustainable.

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
Human caused ignitions are reduced in structured public interface areas.	SRMAs help reduce ignitions.	More SRMAs than A also reduces ignitions.	More SRMs than A also reduces ignitions.	SRMAs would reduce ignitions the most.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
Passive and active restoration methods would lead to improved forage quality and quantity.	No Decision	Passive only would reduce area of improved forage and quantity compared to A, C & D.	Active and passive would result in a greater increase in forage available to livestock.	Active methods would increase forage over a wider area in a shorter time.
Habitat degraded by OHV designations, land disposals, energy and mineral development may impact forage and livestock distribution.	1,738,000 acres	247,000 acres	383,000 acres	434,000 acres
COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
Cross country vehicle use would allow motorized access off of routes.	1.64 million acres	39,000 acres	42,000 acres	42,000 acres
Limited to Designated Routes (including ACECS) reduces motorized access.	272,000 acres	532,000 acres	493,000 acres	277,000 acres
Limited to Existing Routes would reduce cross country travel.	879,000 acres	2 million acres	2.2 million acres	2.5 million acres
Closed routes would limit access.	43,000 acres	260,000 acres	20,000 acres	17,000 acres
Disposal lands may reduce access.	214,000 acres	38,300 acres	108,000 acres	187,000 acres
Acquisition of legal access would improve the ability to reach public land.	Acquisition emphasized.	Acquisition for access not emphasized.	Acquisition and road development emphasized.	Acquisition and road development emphasized
RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES				
Managing OHV as open reduces the quality of the setting for dispersed and primitive recreation.	1.64 million acres	39,000 acres	42,000 acres	42,000 acres
Acquisition in ACECs and WSAs would improve recreational experiences and opportunities.	Acquisition of non-Federal properties would be pursued.	Non-Federal land would be acquired to the extent possible.	Non-Federal land would be acquired to the extent possible.	Non-Federal land would not actively be acquired.
SRMAs maintain recreational experiences, reduce user conflicts, concentrate uses.	2 69,000 acres	3 83,000 acres	3 83,000 acres	4 83,000 acres
ERMAs retain recreational experiences with minor facilities such as kiosks.	No Decision	2 39,000 acres	3 68,000	5 110,000 acres
Closing areas to hunting and target shooting would reduce recreational opportunities.	0.37 percent	1.5 percent	1.4 percent	1.3 percent
VRM I and II could limit developed recreational opportunities such as interpretive sites or OHV use areas.	617,000 acres	1,237,000 acres	910,000 acres	955,000 acres

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
VRM III and IV would allow for opportunities for developed recreational sites or facilities	2,216,000 acres	1,600,000 acres	1,923,000 acres	1,880,000 acres
LANDS AND REALTY				
Disposal lands may be used for community development and improve the BLM's ability to manage the public lands.	213,000 acres	38,000 acres	108,000 acres	187,000 acres
Infrastructure and developments requiring ROWs would be excluded, or contain stipulations on avoidance areas.	532,061 acres	1,029,027 acres	933,021 acres	778,000 acres
Utility corridor width drives the number of lines that may be granted. Co-location would ease construction, maintenance, and operation.	Corridors for major utilities would be ¼-mile wide East-West Vado corridor is ¼-mile wide	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be ½-mile wide An East-West Corridor from Luna County to TX would be designated, and up to ½-mile wide	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be 1 mile wide An East-West Corridor from Luna County to TX would be designated, and up to 2 mile wide	A North-South Doña Ana County/Sierra County corridor would be 2 miles in width An East-West Corridor from Luna County to TX would be designated, and up to 2 mile wide
RENEWABLE ENERGY				
Level of NEPA analysis required increases lead time and costs.	EIS or EA	EIS or EA	EIS or EA	EIS or EA
PEIS Variance Decisions for projects outside Afton SEZ would increase public lands available for utility solar projects.	Variance allowed on 1.3 million acres	30,000 acres Afton SEZ only No Variance	Variance allowed on 1.2 million acres	Variance allowed on 1.2 million acres
Wind projects would be considered on lands outside avoidance/exclusion areas.	1.3 million acres	1.2 million acres.	1.2 million acres	1.3 million acres
MINERALS				
Closing fluid mineral leasing discretionarily would have minimal impact due to low to moderate oil and gas potential.	75,000 acres	75,000 acres	75,000 acres	75,000 acres
Lands open with standard lease terms and conditions for fluid leasing would maximize leasing, exploration and development.	3,655,000 acres	53,000 acres (existing leases)	53,000 acres (existing leases)	53,000 acres (existing leases)
Oil and gas leasing deferral would forego any exploration and development within unleased lands in the short term. Impacts low due to low	0	3,600,000 acres	3,600,000 acres	3,600,000 acres

TABLE 2-12 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ALTERNATIVE				
SUMMARY OF IMPACT	A	B	C	D
to moderate potential.				
Lands withdrawn from locatable mineral entry would lessen opportunities for extraction. Existing claims recognized.	71,000 acres	682,000 acres	337,000 acres	54,000 acres
Closing to mineral materials disposal for development could impact local construction.	361,000 acres	797,000 acres	111,219 acres	353,000 acres
SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS				
Renewable energy opportunities on public land would contribute to economic activities.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Locatable and leasable minerals would continue to provide materials for economic activities.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Public land would provide a stable base for recreational industries.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Livestock grazing would continue with improved forage conditions.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HEALTH AND SAFETY				
Abandoned mine land reclamation program would prevent injury to public land users.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Developed recreational sites would be safe.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maintaining the open OHV designation would increase injury.	1.6 million acres	39,000 acres	42,000 acres	42,000 acres